AN

EXPLANATION

Of the RULES of the

ROYAL GRAMMAR:

Touching the *Preterperfect tenses* and *Supines* of *Verbs* as they are delivered in

LILLIES RULES,

Commonly called

As in Præsenti, &c.

By way of *Question* and *Answer*,

Opening the meanings of the Rules with great plainness to the understanding of Children of meanest capacity.

With choice *Critical Observations* on the same, from the best extant *Authours* and *Grammarians*. For the amending of the *Mistakes*, and supplying of the *Defects* thereof.

By WILLIAM WALKER, B. D.
Authour of the Treatise of the English Particles.

LONDON,
Printed for *Robert Pawlet* at the Sign of the *Bible* in *Chancery Lane* near *Fleet-street*, and *Edward Pawlet* Bookseller in *Grantham*. 1670.

To the Right Reverend Father in God, *John* by Divine Providence Lord Biſhop of *Roche-ſter*, and Dean of *Weſtminſter*; *William Walker* Rector of *Colſterworth* wiſheth all happineſs.

My Lord.

I *Do humbly make bold to Dedicate this Volume of* Explanations *of* Lillies Rules *for the* Preterperfect tenſes *and* Supines *of* Verbs *to your Lordſhips* Name *and* Honour. *Many are the reaſons inducing me thereunto: whereof it may not be amiſs briefly to hint at two or three. And it were enough to claim as great a reſpect as this from*

me to You, that You *and* I *were once* Scholars together *in the ſame School of* Lincoln, *under the ſame Maſter, and in the ſame Seat; and ſo it cannot but become me by ſome honourable reflection to expreſs that affection towards you, which being begotten in youth, is not leſſened by age, but ripened by continuance. But there are more perſwading inducements than this by far. Your Lordſhips great* Eminency *not only for moſt honourable* Places *in the Church, but alſo for moſt noble* Endowments, *and high* Improvements, *worthily recommending You to thoſe Places of honour, do juſtly challenge from all, that Reſpect and Honour, and thoſe Remarks and Teſtimonies thereof, which uſe to be given*

to Perſons of greateſt Note for Vertue and Goodneſs. And therefore it cannot miſ-become me, but rather is incumbent as a Duty upon me, to be paying, in ſuch a way as I am able, my due Reſpects unto your ſo Eminent Merits. *But over and beſides what the deſert of your* many *and* great Vertues, *(vertues to be lov'd and admir'd by all, that have in them any true ſenſe of Vertue or Goodneſs) doth in common challenge from me together with others, there are alſo* Singular Obligations *unto all reſpects towards you lying upon me by my ſelf, from ſeveral* Particular Favours *and* Kindneſſes *done unto me by You. So that all the Honour and Reſpect I were able any way to put upon You, were it much*

more than I am able, would be no other from me, but the juſt tribute *of a worthily deſerved* Gratitude. *And under that notion as I pay, ſo I humbly beg of you to accept of this Reſpect, and withal to pardon this ſo poor an expreſſion of it. I add not, becauſe I need not add, how welcome an Entertainment,* a Name ſo lov'd and honour'd as Yours, *ſtanding in the fore-front of my Book will beſpeak for it in the breaſts of all unbiaſt Perſons. And therefore not to encreaſe your Lordſhips trouble any further, I do earneſtly deſire, that the Lord would long continue your Life and Health, for his own honour and his Churches Service upon Earth, and after Crown you with a bleſſed immortality, and a glorious Eter-*

nity

nity in the Heavens: and so heartily recommending both your Lordships Person, and Relations, and Concernments unto the Divine Protection, and Benediction, I rest,

From *Colsterworth December* the 8th. 1669.

My Lord,
Your Honours most humble and most obliged Servant,

WILLIAM WALKER.

IF any one would be ſatisfied touching any thing deſigned by the Authour in this perfor-mance; It is his deſire, that the General Preface ſet before the firſt Volume of theſe Explanations may be conſulted.

An Explication of the Rules of the *Royal Grammar* touching the *Preter-perfect Tenses* and *Supines* of Verbs, as they are delivered in *Lillies* Rules commonly called *As in præsenti, &c.* by way of Question and Answer.

CHAP. I.

Q. 1. **What Order doth the Grammar observe in its treating of the Preterperfect Tenses and Supines of Verbs?**

An. In its treating of the Preterperfect Tenses and Supines of Verbs, the Grammar observes this order: First, it treats of Verbs Regular, and then of Irregular ones.

Q. 2. **In what order doth it treat of Verbs Regular?**

An. In treating of Verbs Regular, this order the Grammar observes: First it treats of Verbs in *o*, and then of Verbs in *or*.

Q. 3. **What is the order that the Grammar observes in treating of Verbs in o?**

An. The Grammar in treating of Verbs in *o*, observes this order: First it treats of the *Preterperfect* tenses of Verbs, and then of their *Supines*.

Qu. **In treating of the Preterperfect tenſes of Verbs, what is the order that is obſerved by the Grammar?**

An. The order that is obſerved by the Grammar in its treating of the *Preterperfect* tenſes of Verbs is this: Firſt it treats of the Preterperfect tenſes of Verbs *ſimple*, and then of the Preterperfect tenſes of Verbs *compounded*.

Qu. **In what order are the Verbs ſimple treated of?**

An. The Verbs *ſimple* are treated of in the order of the Four Conjugations: Firſt, thoſe of the firſt; then thoſe of the ſecond; Thirdly, thoſe of the third; And laſtly, thoſe of the fourth.

Qu. **What Rule doth the Grammar give for the Preterperfect tenſes of Verbs of the** First Conjugation?

An. The Rule which the Grammar gives for the Preterperfect tenſes of Verbs of the *Firſt Conjugation* is this.

G. Lil. *De ſimplicium verborum primæ Conjugationis communi præterito.*

As in præſenti perfectum format in avi,
ut no nas navi, vocito vocitas vocitavi.

As in præſenti.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That Verbs in *o*, of the firſt Conjugation do form their Preterperfect tenſe of the Preſent tenſe, by changing *as* in the ſecond perſon ſingular of that tenſe into *avi*: As of *no nas* by ſuch change is made *navi*.

¶ The Preterperfect and Preſent tenſe here ſpoken of, are the Preterperfect and Preſent tenſe of the *Indicative mood*: The former of which is formed from the latter, by the change of *as* in the ſecond perſon ſingular into *avi*, as of *vocitas* by the change of the laſt ſyllable *as* into *avi*, is made the Preterperfect of that Verb *vocitavi*.

Qu.

Q. Are there any Exceptions from this Rule?

An. From this Rule there are two Exceptions.

Q. Which is the first Exception from this Rule?

An. The first Exception from this Rule is this:

Deme lavo lavi, juvo juvi, nexoque nexui, *Deme lavo*
Et seco quod secui, neco quod necui, mico verbum
Quod micui, plico quod plicui, frico quod fricui dat,
Sic domo quod domui, tono quod tonui, sono verbum
Quod sonui, crepo quod crepui, veto quod vetui dat:
Atque cubo cubui; varè hæc formantur in avi.

Q. What is the meaning of this Exception?

An. The meaning of this Exception is this: That there are some particular Verbs of the first Conjugation, which do not usually form *as* in the Present tense into *avi* in the Preterperfect tense; but do form it either into *i*, as *lavo* and *juvo*; or into *ui*, as *seco*, *mico*, *frico*, *domo*, *tono*, *sono*, *crepo*, *veto*, *cubo*.

¶ *Lavo lavi*] *Lavi* is properly the Preterperfect tense of the Verb, *lavo lavis* of the third Conjugation: read in *Hor.* 3 *Carm. Od.* 12. *Miserarum est neque amori dare ludum, neque dulci mala vino lavare.* So 1 *Serm.* 5 *Sat. Ora manusque tuâ lavimus Feronia lymphâ.* So *Virg.* 3 *Æn. Luminis effossi fluidum lavit inde cruorem.* So *Cato* c. 96. *Deinde in mari lavito.* But of *lavo lavas* of the first Conjugation, the genuine Preterperf. is *lavavi*, which though now out of use yet anciently was used. Thence the Supine *lavatum*, ordinarily read: As in *Ter. Eun.* 3. 5. *Abeunt lavatum.* So *Hor.* 1 *Serm.* 6 *Sat. Ast ubi me fessum Sol acrior ire lavatum Admonuit. Id. ib.* 3 *Sat. Dum te quadrante lavatum Rex ibit.* And thence also the Participle of the Future in *rus*, *lavaturus*. *Ovid.* 3 *Fast. Sacra lavaturus mane petebat aquas.*

Juvo juvi] *Juvavi* is now out of use, yet formerly used: Whence some even yet write *adjuvarunt* for *adjuverunt*. *Juvaturus* formed thence, is read in *Sall. Jug. Ratus id quod res monebat, frequentiam negotia-*

torum & commeatum juvaturum exercitum. And thence the compound *adjuvaturus* in *Petron. Arbit. Adjuvaturos nos divinam providentiam vel periculo nostro.* And yet though *Vossius* affirm *adjuvatum* also to be read, yet he would not dare to say *juvavit*, however *Manilius* a contemporary with *Theodosius* did not stick to use it. Both of *juvavi*, and *juvaturus* thence formed *Alvarus* saith, *priscum est. Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 20. *Alvar. de Institut. Gram.* p. 234.

Nexoque nexui] That there is such a Verb as *nexo* of the first conjugation if no way else, is evident from that of *Virg. Æn.* 4. *Nexantem nodis seque in sua membra plicantem.* Also from that of *Lucret.* l. 2. *Pars etiam brevibus spatiis nexantur abictu.* But whether that Verb have any such Preterperfect as *nexui* may be doubted. *Vossius*, *Alvarus*, *Farnaby*, *Danes*, *Barles*, deny it to have any. Their reason is, because *nexui* is of *necto*, or *nexo* of the third conjugation. But if a verb of the first conjugation, may have a Preterperfect in *ui* as well as a verb of the third conjugation, as *crepo* hath; then how doth it prove, that *nexo* of the first conjugation hath not *nexui* for his Preterperfect tense, because *nexo* of the third hath the same for his Preterperfect tense: Unless it were that verbs of several conjugations must all, and alwaies have several Preterperfect tenses. As well may *lavo lavas* be said to have no Preterperfect, because *lavi* is the Preterperfect of *lavo lavis*; and so in others: And how shall he that reads *nexui*, be sure that the Authour meant it of *nexo nexis*, rather than of *nexo nexas*? But as not willing to oppose so great Authours, whilst I would vindicate our Grammar, which herein follows *Priscian*, I leave it to the Reader to determine as he thinks best. *Alvar.* p. 236. *Voss. Etymolog.* p. 104. *De Analog.* l. 3. p. 123. *Danes. Schol.* l. 2. c. 11. p. 215.

Et seco quod secui] *Secavi* is now out of use, although once it were used. Thence *Secaturus* in *Colum.* l. 4. c. 9. *Supra quam ramum secaturus est.* Thence *Secatio* in

Cels.

celſ. (though *ſectio* be more uſual) and *ſecator*, and other like verbals. And thence alſo *præſecata gula*, in *Appul. Met.* 1.

Neco quod necui] If this be meant of the ſimple verb, it is a miſtake to think *necui* the uſual preterperfect of that: For *necavi* is moſt ordinarily uſed. Thence *Cic. pro Mil.* *Quæ patris ulciſcendi cauſâ matrem necaviſſet.* & *ib. Niſi forte magis erit parricida, ſi quis conſularem patrem, quàm ſi quis humilem necaverit.* *Sall. Jug.* *Amiſſis amicis, quorum pleroſque ipſe necaverat.* *Curt.* l. 4. *Quem tuorum propinquorum necavi?* *Senec. Med.* *Neptuno genitum necavit.* *Cic.* 1 *Verr.* *Partim in vinculis necavit.* *ib.* *Cum tot innocentes necârit.* And thence the Participle *necatus*. *Suet. Claud.* c. 27. *Qui traderent fraude a Sejano necatum.* *Sall. Jug.* *Alter eorum necatus.* *Ib.* *Si Jugurtham vivum, aut necatum ſibi tradidiſſet, fore*— Whereas *necui* is only read in *Priſcian* l. 9. and from *Ennius*, out of whom he cites this, *Hos peſtis necuit, pars occidit illa duellis.* Which makes me wonder much to ſee, that ſome Grammarians ſhould give *necavi*, and *necui* indifferently for the Preterperfect tenſes of *neco*: as the Grammar of *Gryphiſwald*, *Duisburgenſis* on *Deſpauterius*, and our own Mr. *Harris*: but more that any ſhould give *necui* for the only Preterperfect of it; as *Deſpauter*, *Haine*, *Burler*: and ſomething that any ſhould ſpeak faintly of *necavi*, as of a word rarely uſed, but in this, or that Authour. So Mr. *Bird* ſaith of it, that it ſometimes makes *avi*. So a nameleſs Authour intituling his Book *the Rudiments of the Latine Tongue*, points us to *Salluſt*, as one that had uſed *necavi*. So our own Authour; For, *raro hæc formantur in avi*, muſt be extended unto this, as well as to other verbs. And even Mr. *Farnaby* having delivered *necui* for the Preterperfect of it, in his Margine notes, that *Cic.* in *Verr.* 1. and *Senec. in Med.* had uſed *necavi*. Whereas *Voſſius*, *Alvarus*, *Richerius*, *Ramus*, *Rhenius*, and Mr. *Shirly* do make no other but *necavi* to be the Preterperf.

of it: only *Rhenius* and *Alvarus* telling us, that anciently it made *necui*, which saith *Voſſius*, *vix extra compoſitionem invenitur. Etymol.* p. 103. But in the compounds of *neco, necui* is more uſual, at leaſt in the derivatives of it. Thence *Suet. de Illuſtr. Gram.* c 3. *Veneno ſibi perunxit pedes, & enecuit ita, ut parte ed corporis quaſi præmortui vixerit. Enectus* ordinarily in *Cic.* as, *Avis fame enecta in offam pultis invadit. Enecatorum*, of *enecatus* is read in *Plin.* l. 18. c. 13. Whence *Alvarus*, and ſo *Rhenius* concludes *eneco* to make both *enecui*, and *enecavi*, though *Richerius* be only for *enecui*. Thence alſo *internectus* is ſaid by *Voſſius* and *Stephanus* to be in *Cic. Phil.* 14. *Internecti nota teſtamenta credo ſubjiciunt.* And though I find it not there, yet it may be ſomewhere elſe. *Plaut. Amphit.* ac. 1. ſc. 1. *Duello extincto maximo, atque internectis hoſtibus.* Yet ſome there read it, *internecatis. Rhenius* indeed and *Alvarus* name not any other Preterperfect of *interneco*, but *internecui*, nor Supine but *internectum.*

Mico verbum quod micui] *Solinus* in his 56. chap. hath *micaverit* of *micavi. Si repente micaverit coruſcatio, intempeſtivo metu comprimantur.* But becauſe that Authour, as *Alvarus* ſaith, *non omnibus ſatisfacit*, therefore till the Authority of more Claſſick Authours be had for it, it may be beſt to abſtain from the uſe of it: Though undoubtedly it hath anciently been in uſe. Whence the compound verb *dimico* forms *dimicavi*, as well as *dimicui*; the former whereof is far more uſual than the latter, which *Ovid* uſed l. 2 *Amor. Eleg.* 13. *Hâc tibi ſit pugnâ dimicuiſſe ſatis*: but none elſe that I meet with. And whence alſo *Senec.* l. *de Conſol. ad Albin.* hath *emicaturus* of *emicavi*; as *Alvar.* and *Farn.* cite him. *Sincerus animus ac naturæ ſuæ memor, levis & quandocunque emiſſus fuerit ad ſumma emicaturus.* Though *Voſſius* would rather uſe *emicui*, of *emico*, than *emicavi*, perhaps becauſe *Quintil.* l. 1. c. 6. blames thoſe that had rather uſe *emicavi* than *emicui. Inhærent tamen quidam moleſtiſſimâ diligentiæ perverſitate,*

verſitate, *ut emicavit dicant*, *non emicuit*. And *Farnaby* would uſe none elſe, how much ſoever *emicaturus* is of force with *Ramus*, with whom though *emico* hath only *emicui*, and *ſine Supino*, *attamen emicaturus valet*. *Gram. Lat.* l. 2. c. 2.

Plico quod plicui] *Phocas*, *Diomedes*, *Hanne*, make *plicui* the only Preterperfect of *plico*: which *Alvarus* ſaith he could never find. *Voſſius* gives it no other Preterperfect but *plicavi*. *Etymol.* p. 103. nor *Farnaby* nor *Burles*. And theſe I ſhould chuſe to follow, if I would uſe any ſimple Preterperfect tenſe of this obſolete verb *plico*, as *Richerius* calls it. *Ramus* allows *plicui* ſometimes, *ſed* (ſaith he) *ſæpius eſt analogum*. *Duisburgenſis* is for *plicui*, *& aliquando plicavi*. So Mr. *Bird*, and the *Rudiments*. Mr. *Harris* is indifferent for *plicui*, or *plicavi*: and the *Gryphiſw. Gram.* for both. Theſe differences I preſume proceed not from any Authorities any of them have for either *plicui* or *plicavi* (though if there be any, I fancy, not find, it is of this latter) but from the different Preterperfect tenſes of the compounds of this Verb: Whereof ſome have only *plicavi*, ſome both *plicavi* and *plicui*, though none *plicui* only, that I can find: of which ſee more in the Rules for the Preterperfect tenſes of compounded Verbs.

Frico quod fricui dat] About the Preterperf. of this Verb, Grammarians (which is a wonder) are at great agreement, all for *fricui* ſave that one, or two, allow of *fricavi aliquando*. I doubt, whether either of the one, or the other, any example can be ſhewn. *Voſſius* in his *Etym.* gives *fricui* for the Preterperfect of it. Yet in his *Anal.* l. 3. c. 20. he ſaith of it, *non modò fricui frictum habuit*, *ſed & fricavi fricatum*. The *habuit*, it hath had ſeems to intimate, as if now it had it not. Authority when it can be ſhewn, will diſſolve the doubt. In the mean time that both have been, is evident by the derivatives from both. Such from *fricui*, as *frictio*, read often in *Celſ.* as, *In ipſo quoque itinere frictio*. l. 1. and in *Plin.* l. 23. *Frictiones inhibeat oculorum*. From *fricavi*

cavi is *fricatio*, read in *Plin.* l. 38. c. 4. *Vehemens enim fricatio, spissat, lenis mollit.* and also in *Columel.* l. 6. c. 11. *Si sanguis adhuc supra ungulas in cruribus est, fricatione assiduâ discutitur.* So also the same is evident from the compounds of both. As from *fricui* is *defrictus*: Whence *Colum.* l. 6. c. 12. *Scabies extenuatur trito alio defricto.* And as *perfricuisti* in *Cic. Tusc.* q. l. 3. And *perfricto* in *Plin.* l. 20. c. 14. So from *fricavi* is read *defricatus* in *Plin.* l. 28. c. 12. *Prius defricatis maculis*: in whom also is read *perfricatus*, l. 8. c. 27. *Pantheras perfricata carne aconito (venenum id est) barbari venantur.* Also *infricatus* l. 20. c. 8. *Infricata Polemonia.* And in *Cic. Attic.* l. 12. Ep. 19. *refricaturus. Quæ res forsitan sit refricatura dolorem meum.*

Sic domo quod domui] *Domavi* is not now in use, though it be read in *Accius*; *Olim quod viros domavi.* And *Vossius* cites out of *Florus. Copias ejus domaverunt.* Whence in *Tibul.* l. 14. *domator*, for *domitor*; and in *Tertullian. de Pallio*, *Edomator primus vocis*; So *domatio* and *edomatio* (Whereas *domitio*, and *edomitio* are not said) and *edomabilis.* But from *domui. Virgil* 4 *Georg.* hath *domitarus. Et durum Baccho domitura Saporem. Stat.* 3. *Theb. Sylvas amor unus humumque Edomuisse manu.*

Tono quod tonui] *Tonui* is now the current Preter-perf. of this verb, but *tonavi* also anciently was in use. Thence *Voss. Etymolog.* p. 103. hath *tonaturus*: and both he and *Alvar* cite *tonatio* out of *Senec.* l. 2. *Nat. Quest.* if it be not a mistake of *tonatio* for *tenatio*, (in *Senec.* l. 2. *Nat. Qu.* c. 12.) First made by *Alvarus*, and from him taken up by *Voss. Anal.* l. 3. p. 81. However thence *Paulinus* in his Epistles speaking *de extremo judicio*, saith *Cùm prima signum suscitandis mortuis cœlo tuba intonaverit.* And *Horat.* a more classick Authour. l. *Epod. Od.* 2. *Si quis Eois intonata fluctibus, Hyems ad hoc vertat mare.* Some have thought *tono* to have been anciently of the third conjugat. because of that in *Plaut. Amph.* 5. 1.

ut

ut subitò, ut properè, ut validè tonit. But other copies have *tonuit*: and accordingly so *Vossius* quotes it. *de Analog.* l. 3. c. 20.

Sono verbum quod sonui] *Sonui* is now only in use: but *sonavi* also once was used. Thence *Manilius* l. 5. *Aura per extremas resonavit flebile rupes.* Yea *Tertullian* l. *ad scap.* c. 3. *Et pristina tonitrua quid sonaverint, sciunt qui obdurverunt.* And even *Hor.* l. 1. *Sat.* 4. *Magna sonaturum des nominis hujus honorem.* Whence *Ramus* saith of *Sonaturum* and *intonaturum* Latina sunt. *Gr. Lat.* l. 2. p. 79. And so *Appul. Met.* l. 5. *Ac similiter classicum personavit. Lucret.* l. 3. hath *Sonere* of the third conjugation. *Caligare oculos, sonere aures, succidere artus*; and thence though it self be out of use, yet might remain *sonui*. See *Priscian* l. 10. *Voss. de Analog* l. 3. c. 20. *Alvar.* p. 235.

Crepo quod crepui] *Crepui* in the simple verb is now only used: but that *crepavi* also hath been in use appears, because both *increpo* and *discrepo* the compounds of this verb, have preterperfect tenses in *avi*, as well as in *ui*, though the first make *ui* often, and *avi* seldom, the second seldom makes *ui*, but *avi* often. *Increpui* is in *Plin.* l. 3. *Ep.* 9. *Reliquos legatos graviter increpuit. Sueton.* in *Vespas. Voce etiam gravissimâ increpuit. Increpavi* is in *Plaut. Mostel.* 3. 2. *Nunquid increpavit filium? Sulpit. Sever.* l. 1. *Histor. Sacr. Quanquam plerumque eos pater increpâsse referatur. Discrepo* is in *Cic.* 2. *de Orat. Nihil sane ad rem pertinet, si quâ in re discreparit ab Antonij divisione nostra partitio. Discrepui* in *Hor. de Arte Poet. Sortilegis non discrepuit sententia Delphis.* Hardly elsewhere. This finding of these two compounds thus used with *avi* also, as well as *ui*, I presume was that, which drew *Richerius* to say, *Sed crepo generalem quoque regulam sequitur, & proinde crepavi crepatumque habet.* I wish he had given us his authourity, as well as his word. *Gram. Obsit.* fol. 58. b. of *concrepo* I meet only with *concrepui.*

Veto quod vetui dat] *Vetui* is the current preterperf. tense

tenſe of this verb. In *Perſ. Sat.* 5. *vetavit* is read in ſome Editions, as *Farnabies* and *Lubins*. *Excepto ſi quid Maſuri ribrica vetavit.* But *Voſſius*, who alſo cites this verſe for the proof of *vetavi*, yet tells us that *in aliis libris pro vetavit eſt notavit:* as alſo doth *Trebell. Pollio* in his *Promptuarium.* Yet *Ramus* and *Renius* own that reading of *vetavi* there. In *Stat.* 3 *Theb.* there is ſaid to be read *vetatus.* Thither both *Farnaby* and *Voſſius* ſend us for it. And there in *v.* 624. I find *vetitum* indeed; and in *ver.* 550. *vetanti:* But no *vetatus.* Perhaps in their books that was *vetato*, which in mine is *vetanti.* However it remains that it is uncertain, whether *vetavi*, or *vetatus* be rightly read in any Authour: And then ſome of our Engliſh Gram. Writers might have done well not to have delivered it by way of Rule, either that *veto* doth make indifferently *vetui* and *vetavi*, as Mr. *Harris*; or ſometimes *avi*, as Mr. *Bird*, and *the Rudiments.* And the uſe of *vetavi* would be forborn, until it may be juſtified by an uncontroverted genuinely read example. Yet that *vetavi* hath been uſed is likely enough, for in *Valla.* l. 1. *vetaturus*, and *vetatio* is read: which latter *Voſſius* owns as rightly ſaid, and not *vetitio.* *De Analog.* l. 3. c. 20.

Atque cubo cubi] Though *Quintil.* be the only Authour I find produced, for the uſe of the ſimple preterperfect tenſe *cubavi*, ſaying l. 8. c. 2. *Fingitur in Scholis ſupra ſe cubaſſe.* Yet by the derivatives from it, *cubatio* and *cubatus*, to be found in our Lexicographers (and the latter cited by *Cooper* from *Pliny*, and ſo by *Stephanus*, who cites *Plin.* ſaying l. 10. c. 57. *Medicina in fame, & cubatus in fumo*) and by the compounds of it, it doth appear to have antiently been in more requeſt. Thence in *Plin.* l. 11. c. 16. *Nam niſi incubavere, favos lividos faciunt.* ib. l. 29. c. 3. *Cum triduo incubata tolluntur.* l. 10. c. 56. *Sed quibus certa fœcunditas, rara, & incubatio Ovis noxia*, &c. c. 59. *Incubationi datur initium poſt novam lunam.* ib. *Si incubatu* (perhaps *in cubatu*) *tonuerit, ova pereunt.* Where alſo is read, *Quæ-*

dam

dam autem & citra incubitum ſponte naturæ gignunt. Thence alſo *ſupercubavi*, in *Appul. Met.* l. 6. *Credemus etiam exemplo tuæ veritatis & Europam ſeuro ſupercubâſſe.* And thence alſo *accubatio in Cic. de Sen. niſi accubationem ſcribendum putes*, ſaith *Voſſius, de Anal.* l. 3. c. 20.

Qu. **Which is the ſecond Exception from the General Rule?**

An. The ſecond *Exception* from the General Rule is this:

Do, das rite dedi, ſto ſtas formare ſteti vult. *Do, das*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Exception?**

An. The meaning of this Exception is this: That theſe two Verbs *do*, and *ſto*, do not form their Preterperfect tenſe by changing *as* of the Preſent tenſe into *avi*: but into *edi*, and *eti*: as, *do, das, dedi; ſto, ſtas, ſteti.*

¶ *Do das rite dedi*] Though *davi* of *do* be no where to be found, yet *datum* formed as of *davi*, is the only Supine of *do*, whence alſo are other verbals formed, *dator*, and *datio*.

Sto ſtas formare ſteti vult] Yet that antiently it formed *ſtavi*, is evident both from the Supine of this verb *ſtatum*, and the derivatives of it *ſtator*, and *ſtatio*, &c. and alſo from *præſtavi*, and *reſtavi* uſed by *Propertius*, and *Ammonius*, &c. Of which ſee afterward in the Rule for the preterperfect tenſes of compounded verbs, *Natum a ſto ſtas.*

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule, and the Exceptions from it declined.** The Declining of the words.

An. The words of this Rule, and the exceptions from it are declined thus.

No, nas, navi, nare, natum.
Vocito, vocitas, vocitavi, vocitare, vocitatum.
Lavo, lavas, lavi, lavare { *lavatum*, *lautum*, *lotum.*
Juvo, juvas, juvi, juvare, [*jutum.*]*

Nexo,

Nexo, nexas, [nexui] nexare.
Seco, secas, secui, secare, sectum.
Neco, necas, necavi, necare, necatum.
Mico, micas, [micui] micare.
Plico, plicas, plicavi [plicui] plicare, plicatum.
Frico, fricas, fricui, fricare, frictum.
Domo, domas, domui, domare, domitum.
Tono, tonas, tonui, tonare, tonitum.
Sono, sonas, sonui, sonare, sonitum.
Crepo, crepas, crepui, crepare, crepitum.
Veto, vetas, vetui, vetare, vetitum.
Cubo, cubas, cubui, cubare, cubitum.
Do, das, dedi, dare, datum.
Sto, stas, steti, stare, statum.

* *Jutum* is not read but in compoſition, as *adjutum*: So *juvatum* is in *adjuvatum*, whence *adjuvaturus*. *Voſſ. Etymol.* p. 102.

And thus much of the Rule for the Preterperfect tenſes of Verbs of the firſt Conjugation.

CHAP. II.

Qu. What rule doth the Grammar give for the Preterperfect tenſes of Verbs of the ſecond Conjugation?

An. For the Preterperfect tenſes of Verbs of the *ſecond Conjugation* the Grammar gives this Rule.

Secundæ Conjugationis commune præteritum.
Es in præſenti perfectum format ui dans
Es in præſenti *ut nigreo, nigres, nigrui.*

Qu. what is the meaning of this Rule?

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That Verbs of the ſecond Conjugation do form their Preterperfect tenſe of the ſecond perſon ſingular of their Preſent tenſe, by changing *es* into *ui*; as of *nigreo nigres* by ſuch change is made *nigrui*.

Es

Es in præsenti] Not all Verbs in *eo* are of the second Conjugation (for *beo, creo, sereo, meo, calceo, laqueo, nauseo,* and *emuncto,* and those that are compounded of any of them, as *recreo, permeo, illaqueo,* &c. are of the first Conjugation; and again *eo* and *queo,* and their compounds, as *abeo, veneo, nequeo,* &c. are of the fourth Conjugation) but those only which have *es* in the second person, as well as *eo* in the first.

Ut nigreo nigres nigrui] *Nigrui* is read in *Colum.* l. 12. c. 48. *Olivæ cum nigruerint, nec adhuc tum præmaturæ fuerint; sereno cœlo distringere manu convenit.* But for *nigreo* Authours more familiarly use *nigresco. Ovid. 1 Trist. El.* 3. *Æquora nigrescunt ventis.*

Qu. **Is there any Exception from this General Rule?**

An. From this General Rule there is this one large Exception: *Jubeo excipe jussi,* &c. *Jubeo excipe*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Exception?**

An. The meaning of this Exception is this: That there are verbs of ten several terminations, which do not from *es* in the Present tense form a Preterperfect in *ui.*

Qu. **Which are these ten Terminations?**

An. Those ten Terminations are *veo, ceo, deo, geo, leo, neo, queo, reo, veo,* and *ieo.*

Qu. **What Verbs in beo do not form a Preterperf. in ui?**

An. In *beo, jubeo* doth not form its Preterperfect in *ui,* but hath *jussi* for its Preterperfect tense: So our Authour --*jubeo excipe jussi.*

Qu. **What Verbs in ceo do not form a Preterfect in *ui*?**

An. In *ceo* two Verbs, *mulceo* and *luceo,* do not form a Preterperfect in *ui,* but *mulceo* hath *mulsi,* and *luceo* hath *luxi:* So our Authour —— *Mulceo mulsi, Luceo vult luxi.* *Mulceo mulsi*

Qu. **What Verbs in deo do not form a Preterperfect in ui?** *Sedeo sedi*

An.

An. There are eleven Verbs in *deo* here reckoned up by our Authour, which do not form their Preterperfect by changing *es* into *ui*: but some of them form it in *di*, by changing *des* into *di*, and some form it in *si*, by changing *des* into *si*.

Qu. **What Verbs in** deo **form their Preterperfect in** di?

An. In *deo* here are named eight verbs that form their Preterperfect in *di*, viz. *sedeo sedi, video vidi, prandeo prandi, strideo stridi, pendeo pependi, mordeo momordi, spondeo spospondi*, and *tondeo totondi*. So our Authour

—— *Sedeo sedi videoque*
Vult vidi. Sed prandeo prandi, stridea stridi, &c.

¶ To these Verbs that form their preterperfect in *di*, Mr. *Farnaby* adds *frendeo*, which maketh *frendi*.

Qu. **What Verbs in** deo **form their Preterperfect in** si?

An. There be three Verbs in *deo* which form their Preterperfect in *si*: viz. *suadeo suasi, rideo risi*, and *ardeo arsi*. So our Authour——

Suadeo suasi, rideo risi, habet ardeo & arsi.

Qu. **What is the meaning of that note annexed to this branch of Exception——**

Quatuor his infra

Quatuor his infra geminatur syllaba prima:
Pendeo namque pependi, mordeo vultque momordi,
Spondeo habere spospondi, tondeo vultque totondi.

An. The meaning of that Note is: That these four Verbs *pendeo, mordeo, spondeo* and *tondeo*, besides their changing *des* into *di*, do also double the first Syllable of their Present tense in their Preterperfect tense, so that of *pendeo* is made *pependi*, of *mordeo momordi*, of *spondeo spospondi*, and of *tondeo totondi*.

L, vel R ante Geo

Qu. **What Verbs in** geo **do not form their Preterperfect in** ui?

An. Such Verbs in *geo* as have *L* or *R* before *geo*, do not form their Preterperfect in *ui*, but in *si* as *urgeo ursi*, *mulgeo mulsi* of which also is formed *mulxi*. So our Authour---

L vel

L vel R ante geo ſi ſtet, geo vertitur in ſi,
urgeo ut ursi, mulgeo mulſi, dat quoque mulxi.

¶ To theſe we may add *algeo alſi*, *fulgeo fulſi*, *indulgeo indulſi*, *tergeo terſi*.

Qu. **Are there any Verbs in** geo **not having** L **or** R **before** geo, **which form a Preterperfect not in** ui ?

An. Beſides thoſe Verbs which have *L* or *R* before *geo*, theſe three *frigeo*, *lugeo* and *augeo* do form their Preterperfect not in *ui*, but in *xi* : as *frigeo frixi*, *lugeo luxi*, and *augeo auxi*. So our Authour.

Frigeo frixi, *lugeo luxi*, *habet augeo & auxi.*

Qu. **What Verbs in** leo **do not form their Preterperfect in** ui ? *Dat fleo*

An. There be three Verbs in *leo*, which do not form their Preterperfect tenſe in *ui*, but in *evi* : Which are *fleo*, and the two old obſolete Verbs *leo* and *pleo*, with their compounds *defleo*, *deleo*, *impleo*, &c. So our Authour.

Dat fleo flet flevi, *leo les levi*, *indique natum*
Deleo delevi, *pleo ples plevi.*

Qu. **What Verbs in** neo **do not form their Preterperfect in** ui ? *A maneo manſi*

An. There are two Verbs in *neo*, which have not *ui* in their Preterperfect tenſe, namely *neo*, which hath *nevi*, and *maneo* which hath *manſi* : So our Authour,

---Neo nevi. A maneo manſi fervatur.

Qu. **What Verbs in** queo **do not form their Preterperfect in** ui ? *Torqueo torſi*

An. There is one Verb in *queo*, which doth not form a Preterperfect in *ui*, but *ſi*; and that is *torqueo*, whoſe Preterperfect tenſe is *torſi* : So our Authour——*Torqueo torſi.*

Qu. **What Verbs in** reo **do not form a Preterperfect in** ui ? *Hæreo vult hæſi*

An. There is one Verb in *reo*, which doth not form its Preterperfect in *ui*, but in *ſi* : and that is *hæreo*, whoſe

whose Preterperfect tense is *hæsi*: So our Authour ——*Hæreo vult hæsi.*

Veo si vi

Qu. **What Verbs in veo do not form a Preterperfect in ui?**

An. No Verbs in *veo* do form a Preterperfect in *ui*, but all that end in *veo* in the Present tense have *vi* in their Preterperfect tense: as *ferveo fervi*, *niveo nivi*, and so the compound thereof *conniveo connivi*, which also anciently hath had *connixi*: So our Authour——

Veo fit vi, ut ferveo fervi
Niveo et inde satum possit conniveo nivi
Et nixi.

Cieo civi

Qu. **What Verbs in ieo do not form their Preterperfect in ui?**

An. There be two Verbs in *ieo* which do not form their Preterperfect in *ui*, but in *ivi* and *evi*; namely *cieo* which hath *civi*, and *vieo* which hath *vievi*: So our Authour —— *Cieo civi, vieóque vievi.*

¶ *Sorbeo sorbui habet forbsi quoque*] That *sorbeo* hath *sorbui* appears from *Plin.* l. 22. c. 18. *His qui coagulum lacti is sorbuerint.* But *sorpsi* it hath not. That Preterperfect tense if it be any where read out of composition (as hardly it) is of *sorbo* of the third conjugation from whence yet remains the Supine *sorptum*, read as *Vossius* saith, in *Plin.* though *sorbitum* also, from whence *sorbitio* the verbal, is allowed of amongst most Grammarians. That, I presume which drew our Authour to give this verb these two Preterperfect tenses *sorbui*, and *sorpsi*, is because the compound verb *absorbeo* is read with them both (unless we will allow of *absorbo* too, as well as *absorbeo*:) With *sorbui* in *Cic.* in *Brut. Sed hunc absorbuit æstus quidam non insolitæ adolescentibus gloriæ.* With *sorpsi* in *Lucan.* l. 4. *Absorpsit penitus rupes & tecta ferarum.* Though not only *Valerius Probus*, and *Velius Longus* condemn the simple *sorpsi*, but *Caper* also misliks *absorpsi*, though in *Lucan.* Some have gone about to confirm the use of *sorpsi* by a place in *Plin. Et vernatio utilis erit, si postquam sorpta fuerit,*

deinde

deinde rejicitur. But *Alvarus* tells us; he could never find any such place, nor any body that named Book, or Chapter, where it was to be read. Other compounds of *Sorbeo*, as *exsorbeo*, and *resorbeo*, are by Grammarians allowed the same formations with *absorbeo*. But though I find many instances of *exsorbui*; as *Cic. Phil.* 2. *Gustâras vilem sanguinem vel potius exsorbueras. Id.* 2. *Tuscul. Jam decolorem sanguinem omnem exsorbuit. Id pro Muræn. Difficultatem exsorbuit*: Yet I find none of *exsorpsi*, as yet. And if the old Grammarians had much adu to allow *absorpsi* with an authourity, much less would they have allowed *exsorpsi* without one. But I shall not contend with any about it. See *Voss. Etymolog.* p. 104. *Rhen.* p. 173. *Richer.* p. 60. *Gram. Gyphisw.* p. 39. *Alvar.* p. 237.

Hither, for likeness of termination of present tense, may be referred, what is observed of *habeo*, namely that it is found in *Plaut. Asin.* ac. 3. sc. 2. & ac. 4. sc. 1. to have *habuvi*, or *habivi*. But that is only to be noted, not to be imitated; it is so very obsolete.

Mulceo mulsi] See below in *mulgeo.*

Lugeo vult luxi] See below in *lugeo.*

Stridco stridi] *Senec. Herc. Oet. Morior, nec ullus per meum stridit latus Transmissus ensis. Stridi* is of *strido: stridui* of *strideo*, is to be found in *Priscian:* but it is now out of use.

Habet arceo & arsi] *Arcui* anciently was in use: whence *arcuerunt*: but that now is become obsolete: and only *arsi* remains in use.

Quatuor his infra geminatur syllaba &c.] It was usual amongst the Ancients (saith Mr. *Danes*) to write and speak those verbs with an *e* in the first syllable, which in the declining had the first syllable of their Present tense doubled in the Preterperfect tense: as *memordi, spespondi*, &c. Insomuch that *memordi, pepugi, spespondi* are words used even by *Cicero*, and *Cæsar*. The reason of this we have given us by *Gellius*, namely *quoniam Græci in quâdam Specie temporis, quod παρακείμενον*

whose Preterperfect tense is *hæsi*: So our Authour
——*Hæreo vult hæsi.*

Veo si vi

Qu. What Verbs in veo do not form a Preterperfect in ui?

An. No Verbs in *veo* do form a Preterperfect in *ui*, but all that end in *veo* in the Present tense have *vi* in their Preterperfect tense: as *ferveo fervi*, *niveo nivi*, and so the compound thereof *conniveo connivi*, which also anciently hath had *connixi*: So our Authour——
Veo fit vi, ut ferveo fervi
Niveo et inde satum possit conniveo nivi
Et nixi.

Cieo civi

Qu. What Verbs in ieo do not form their Preterperfect in ui?

An. There be two Verbs in *ieo* which do not form their Preterperfect in *ui*, but in *ivi* and *evi*; namely *cieo* which hath *civi*, and *vieo* which hath *vievi*: So our Authour —— *Cieo civi, vieóque vievi.*

¶ *Sorbeo sorbui hæbet sorbsi quoque*] That *sorbeo* hath *sorbui* appears from *Plin.* l. 22. c. 18. *His qui coagulum lactis sorbuerint.* But *sorpsi* it hath not. That Preterperfect tense if it be any where read out of composition (as hardly it) is of *sorbo* of the third conjugation from whence yet remains the Supine *sorptum*, read as *Vossius* saith, in *Plin.* though *sorbitum* also, from whence *sorbitio* the verbal, is allowed of amongst most Grammarians. That, I presume which drew our Authour to give this verb these two Preterperfect tenses *sorbui*, and *sorpsi*, is because the compound verb *absorbeo* is read with them both (unless we will allow of *absorbo* too, as well as *absorbeo*:) With *sorbui* in *Cic.* in *Brut. Sed hunc absorbuit æstus quidam non insolitæ adolescentibus gloriæ.* With *sorpsi* in *Lucan.* l. 4. *Absorpsit penitus rupes & tecta ferarum.* Though not only *Valerius Probus*, and *Velius Longus* condemn the simple *sorpsi*, but *Caper* also mislikes *absorpsi*, though in *Lucan.* Some have gone about to confirm the use of *sorpsi* by a place in *Plin. Et vernatio utilis erit, si postquam sorpta fuerit, dcinde*

deinde rejicitur. But *Alvarus* tells us; he could never find any such place, nor any body that named Book, or Chapter, where it was to be read. Other compounds of *Sorbeo*, as *exsorbeo*, and *resorbeo*, are by Grammarians allowed the same formations with *absorbeo*. But though I find many instances of *exsorbui*; as *Cic. Phil.* 2. *Gustâras vilem sanguinem vel potius exsorbueras. Id.* 2. *Tuscul. Jam decolorem sanguinem omnem exsorbuit. Id pro Muræn. Difficultatem exsorbuit*: Yet I find none of *exsorpsi*, as yet. And if the old Grammarians had much adu to allow *absorpsi* with an authourity, much less would they have allowed *exsorpsi* without one. But I shall not contend with any about it. See *Voss. Etymolog.* p. 104. *Rhen.* p. 173. *Richer.* p. 60. *Gram. Gyphisw.* p. 39. *Alvar.* p. 237.

Hither, for likeness of termination of present tense, may be referred, what is observed of *habeo*, namely that it is found in *Plaut. Asin.* ac. 3. sc. 2. & ac. 4. sc. 1. to have *habuvi*, or *habivi*. But that is only to be noted, not to be imitated; it is so very obsolete.

Mulceo mulsi] See below in *mulgeo*.

Lucco vult luxi] See below in *lugeo*.

Strideo stridi] *Senec. Herc. Oet. Morior, nec ullus per meum stridit latus Transmissus ensis. Stridi* is of *strido*: *stridui* of *strideo*, is to be found in *Priscian*: but it is now out of use.

Habet ardeo & arsi] *Arduí* anciently was in use: whence *arduerunt*: but that now is become obsolete: and only *arsi* remains in use.

Quatuor his infra geminatur syllaba &c.] It was usual amongst the Ancients (saith Mr. *Danes*) to write and speak those verbs with an *e* in the first syllable, which in the declining had the first syllable of their Present tense doubled in the Preterperfect tense: as *memordi*, *spespondi*, &c. Insomuch that *memordi*, *pepugi*, *spespondi* are words used even by *Cicero*, and *Cæsar*. The reason of this we have given us by *Gellius*, namely *quoniam Græci in quâdam Specie temporis*, *quod παρακείμενον*

appellant, secundam verbi literam in e *plerunque vertunt, ut γράφω γέγραφα*, &c. And no doubt (saith *Voſſius*) *quin hujuſmodi præteritorum geminatio facta ſit exemplo Græcorum.* That way of writing is long ſince laid aſide, only it remains as yet in ſome verbs of the third conjugation: as *cecidi* of *cado*, *cecîdi* of *cædo*, *peperci* of *parco*, *peperi* of *pario*, *feſelli* of *fallo*, *tetegi* of *tango*, &c. See *Gell.* l. 7. c. 9. *Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 19.

Spondeo habere ſpoſpondi.] So it is uſually now written: but *ſpopondi* is the writing antiently in uſe. So *Cic. Panſa, aut vitâ, aut morte ſe ſatisfacturum reipublicæ ſpopondit. Id dependendum tibi eſt, quod mihi pro illo ſpopondiſti.* Analogy indeed requires it ſhould be *ſpoſpondi*: but ſaith *Priſcian*) *ob ευφωνίαν alterum* ſ *omittitur. Priſcian* l. 5. *Voſſ. de Etymolog* p. 105.

Mulgeo mulſi, dat quoque mulxi.] *Mulceo* and *mulgeo* (as *Alvarus* tells us) have the ſame Preterperfect tenſes and Supines. Thence *mulſi* of *mulceo*, in *Ovid. Terque manu permulſit eum.* And thence the ſame from *mulgeo* in *Plin.* l. 10. c. 40. *Caprique cæcitas, quas ita mulcere, aboritur.* Some for diſtinctions ſake, as *Priſcian* l. 9. noteth, ſaid *mulxi*, when they would be underſtood to mean their word from *mulgeo*. And *Diomedes* delivers *mulxi* for the Preterperfect tenſe of *mulgeo* only, whereas *Focas* makes *mulſi* the common Preterperfect of both. But as *mulctra*, *mulctrum*, and *Mulctrale* ſhew there was *mulxi* of *mulgeo*, ſo that the ſame was alſo of *mulceo* is ſhewed, not only by that paſſage of *Sall.* l. 4. *Hiſtor.* recited by *Priſcian*, wherein he hath *verbis permulcti*, but alſo by that of *Gellius* l. 1. c. 11. *Nihil adeo in congrediendis hoſtibus, atque in principiis prælii orum ad ſalutem virtutemq; aptius rati, quàm ſi permulcti ſonis metioribus non immodicè ferocirent.* From *mulſi* of *mulceo* comes *permulſus*, whence *Cic. ad Heren. Lædunt arteriæ ſi ante quàm leni voce permulſæ ſunt, acri clamore compleantur.* But whether the like come of *mulgeo*, I cannot ſay. *Alvar.* p. 230, 240. *Voſſ. Anal.* l. 3. c. 23. *Daneſ. Schol.* l. 2. c. 11.

Frigeo

Frigeo frixi] An instance of *frixi* perhaps may not be easie to give: but as *Alvarus* saith, it is understood by the compound of it, *refrigeo, seu refrigesco*; we may add *perfrigeo*, or *perfrigesco*. So *Cic.* l. 9. *Fam. Ep. Ego catera, qui animo æquo fero, unum vereor, ne hasta Cæsaris refrixerit, Id pro Planc. Nunc in causâ refrixit. Ter. Adelph.* 2. 2. *ubi illinc redieto, actum agam. Nihil est, refrixeritres. Corn. Cels.* l. 1. c. 3. *At ei qui perfrixit, opus est Balneo primùm involuto sedere, donec insudet tum ungi. Prisc.* l. 9. hath *frigui*: but without an example: So that the use of that Preterperfect tense now *refrixit*: But yet as *frigui* was of *frigeo*, so no doubt *frixi* is of *frigo. Alvar.* (p. 240. *Voss. Analog.* l. 3. c. 23.

Lugeo luxi] *Lugeo* then and *luceo* have the same Preterperfect tense, and that both in the singular and compounded Verbs. Hence *Agræcius*, *Eluxit qui ductum deponit: illuxit cum lumen apparuit.*

Leo les levi] The simple verb *leo* is grown out of use, though formerly used: from the Supine whereof, *Deleo* (as *Vossius* saith) is called *letum, quia let, hoc est delet omnia.* Yet it remains in the compound of it, *deleo. Voss. Anal.* l. 3. c. 23.

Pleo ples plevi] This old Verb derived from the Greek πλέω, and anciently in use (whence that of *Festus, Plentur antiqui etiam sine præpositione dicebant*) is now not used; remaining only in the compounds of it, *impleo, compleo, depleo, expleo, repleo. Voss. Analog.* l. 3. c. 47.

Ferveo fervi] *Fervi* is rather the Preterperfect of *fervo* anciently used (insomuch that in *Ter. Ad.* 4. 1. is read, *Cum fervit maxime, tam placidum quàm suavem reddo.* So in *Virg. Æn.* 4. *Jam littora fervere stygiis.*) Yet grown out of use in *Quintilian*'s time; insomuch that if any one *antiquos secutus fervere brevi medii syllabâ dicat, deprehendatur vitiosè loqui*, as he saith, *Instit.* l. 1. c. 6. Thence *Ter. Ad.* 1. 2. *Sperabam jam deferviſſe adoleſcentiam.* Of *ferveo fervui* changed by

reason of the affinity of *b* and *u* into *ferbeo ferbui* is read in *Cic. deferbui. Cum adolescentiæ cupiditates deferbuissent*: So he, *Orat. pro Cœl.* Thence also in *Horace.* 1 *Serm. Velatumque stolâ mea cum conferbuit ira.* And in *Cic. pro Cœl. Si nimium efferbuisse videtur hujus in gerendis inimicitiis vis*— *Voss. Etymolog.* p. 109. and *Analog.* l. 3. c. 24. *Alvar.* p. 242. *Schrevel.* in *Ter. Ad.* 1. 2. 72.

Niveo & inde satum -] *Niveo* is an old antiquated word, instead whereof the compound *conniveo* is in use, and taught in *Grammars*. This is read with two Preter-perfect tenses; the one more usual, which is *connivi* (which yet *Rhenius* saith is formed of *connivo* of the third conjugation.) *Plaut. Mænech.* 4. 3. *Quia connivi, ut me defrudes, ad eam rem affectas viam.* Thence *Appul.* hath *conniverat*: The other less used, namely *connixi*, cited by *Priscian.* l. 9. from *Turpilius* an old Comædian. *Dum ego connixi somno, hic sibi prospexit vigilans Virginem. Voss. Analog.* l. 3. c. 24. *Etymolog.* p. 109. *Alvar.* p. 241. *Rhen.* p. 180.

Q. How are the words of this Rule, and the Exception from it declined?

The declining of the words.

An. The words in this Rule and the Exception from it are declined thus:

Nigreo, nigres, nigrui, nigrere.
Jubeo, jubes, jussi, jubere, jussum.
Sorbeo, sorbes, sorbui, sorbere, sorptum.
Mulceo, mulces, mulsi, mulcere, mulsum.
Luceo, luces, luxi, lucere.
Sedeo, sedes, sedi, sedere, sessum.
Video, vides, vidi, videre, visum.
Prandeo, prandes, prandi, prandere, pransum.
Strideo, strides, stridi, stridere.
Suadeo, suades, suasi, suadere, suasum.
Rideo, rides, risi, ridere, risum.
Ardeo, ardes, arsi, ardere, arsum.
Pendeo, Pendes, pependi pendere.
Mordeo, mordes, momordi, mordere, morsum.

Spon-

Spondeo, ſpondes, ſpoſpondi, ſpondere, ſponſum.
Tondeo, tondes, totondi, tondere, tonſum.
Urgeo, urges, urſi, urgere,
Mulgeo, mulges, mulſi, mulgere, mulctum.
Frigeo, friges, frixi, frigere.
Lugeo, luges, luxi, lugere, luctum.
Augeo, auges, auxi, augere, auctum.
Fleo, fles, flevi, flere, fletum.
Deleo, deles, delevi, delere, deletum.
Impleo, imples, implevi, implere, impletum.
Neo, nes, nevi, nere, netum.
Maneo, manes, manſi, manere, manſum.
Torqueo, Torques, torſi, torquere, tortum.
Hæreo, hæres, hæſi, hærere, hæſum.
Ferveo, ferves, fervi, fervere.
Connivio, connives, connivi, [counixi,] connivere.
Cieo, cies, civi, ciere, citum.
Vieo, vies, vievi, viere, vietum.

And thus far of the Rule of the Preterperfect tenſes of Verbs of the ſecond Conjugation.

CHAP. III.

Q1. IS there any one General Rule for the Preterperfect tenſes of Verbs of the third Conjugation?

An. There is no one General Rule for the Preterperfect tenſes of Verbs of the third conjugation: but according to the different termination of the Preſent tenſe, ſo there is a different formation of the Preterperfect tenſe; which is the meaning of that Prefatory Verſe, wherewith the Rules for the Preterperfect tenſes of verbs of that Conjugation are uſhered in; *viz.*

Tertia Conjugatio.
Tertia præteritum formabit ut hic manifeſtum.

Q1. If a Verb of the third Conjugation end in

bo, **what Rule is there for the Preterperfect tenſe of that Verb?**

An. The Rule for the Preterperfect tenſe of Verbs of the third Conjugation ending in *bo* is this--

Bo fit bi ut lambo lambi.

Bo fit bi.

Qu. **What is the meaning of that Rule?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That if a verb of the third Conjugation end in *bo* in the Preſent tenſe, the Preterperfect is formed of it by changing *bo* into *bi*, as of *lambo* by ſuch change is made *lambi*.

Qu. **Is there any Exception from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule there is this Exception:

——— *Scribo excipe ſcripſi.*
Et nubo nupſi; antiquum cumbo cubui dat.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Exception?**

An. The meaning of this Exception is this: That theſe two uſual Verbs *ſcribo* and *nubo* do not form their Preterperfect tenſe of the Preſent tenſe by changing *bo* into *bi*, but by changing of it into *pſi*: and the old verb *cumbo* his, by changing *bo* into *bui*, and loſing *m* from out of the middle of it. And to this Exception may be added *glubo* which makes *glupſi*.

¶ *ut lambo lambi*] *Calpurn. Ecl.* 10. *Nulla lamberunt ore liquores. Lucil.* l. 23. *Jucundaſque puer quas lamberat ore placentas.* For thoſe that talk of *lambo lambui*, or *lambio lambivi*, we read, but follow not what they ſay in that.

Antiquum cumbo] Though the ſimple Verb *cumbo* be not in uſe, yet the compounds of it *accumbo*, *incumbo*, *diſcumbo*, *procumbo*, *recumbo*, *ſuccumbo*, &c. are uſual.

Qu. **How decline you the words of this Rule?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus:

The Declining of the words.

Lambo, lambis, lambi, lambere.
Scribo, ſcribis, ſcripſi, ſcribere, ſcriptum.
Nubo, nubis, nupſi, nubere, nuptum.
Cumbo, cumbis, cubui, cumbere, cubitum.

Qu.

Qu. **When a Verb of the third conjugation ends in co, what is the Rule for the Preterperfect of that Verb?**

An. The Rule for the Preterperfect tense of Verbs of the third Conjugation ending in *co*, is this: *Co fit ci.* *Co fit ci.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That of a Verb of the third Conjugation ending in *co*, the Preterperfect tense is formed from the Present tense by changing *co* into *ci*: as of *ico* by such change is made *ici*; and so of *vinco vici*, save that this Verb beside the change of *co* into *ci*, loseth also *n* out of the middle of it.

Qu. **Hath this Rule any Exception?**

An. This Rule hath this Exception:

Vult parco peperci *Vult parco peperci.*

Et parsi, dico dixi, duco quoque duxi.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Exception?**

An. The meaning of this Exception is this: That *parco, dico*, and *duco* do form their Preterperfect tense differently from the Rule; the first by reduplicating the first letter of the word with *e* in the beginning, and changing of *a* into *e* in the middle, the two other by changing *c* into *x*.

¶ *ut vinco vici*] *Vinco* forms *vici* from the old verb *vico*: from which verb, saith *Vossius* is derived *Vicapota*, the name of a Goddess, *Quæ dat vincere & potiri*; and also *pervicax, qui ad victoriam perseverat. Voss. Etymol.* p. 110.

Vult parco peperci & parsi] *Peperci* is ordinary; *parsi* more rare, yet read in *Ter. Hec.* 3. 1. *Hancine ego vitam parsi perdere?* So *Plaut. Pœn.* 5. 2. *Qui sit, cujatis, ne parseris. Vossius* also saith *parcisset* is in *Gell.* l. 5. c. 15. But there, at least in my Book, it is *pepercisset*. Anciently it had *parcui* for a Preterperfect tense; thence the Supine *parcitum*; and thence the Participle *parcitus*, read in *Plin.* l. 30. c. 4. *Italiæ parcitum est vetere interdicto Patrum ut diximus*; If that be the right reading

of the place: of which see after in *Hæc raro aut nunquam*. And thence *parcitas* in *Sen.* l. 1. *de clementia*. *Civitatis mores magis corrigit parcitas animadversionum Alvar.* p. 244. and from him *Voss. Analog.* l. 3. c. 25.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule, &c. declined?**

An. The words of this Rule and Exception are declined thus:

The declining of the words.

Vinco, vincis, vici, vincere, victum.
Parco, parcis, peperci & parsi, parcere, parcitum & parsum
Dico, dicis, dixi, dicere, dictum.
Duco, ducis, duxi, ducere, ductum.

Qu. **What is the Rule for the Preterperfect tense of a verb ending in** do?

An. The Rule for the Preterperfect tense of a verb ending in *do* is this: *Do fit di, ut mando mandi.*

Do fit di.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That of a verb ending in *do* in the Present tense, the Preterperfect tense is formed by changing *do* into *di*; as of *mando* by such change is made *mandi*.

Qu. **Are there any Exceptions from this Rule?**

An. There are three Exceptions from this Rule.

Qu. **Which is the first?**

An. The first is of some, that beside the change of *do* into *di*, do also lose *n* out of the middle, as —*Scindo scidi, dat Findo fidi, fundo fudi.*

Qu. **Which is the second?**

An. The second is of some, that admit of a reduplication in the beginning, as ——*Tundo tutudique*
Pendo pependi, tendo tetendi, pedo pepedi,
Junge cado cecidi, pro verbero cædo cecidi.

Qu. **Which is the third?**

An. The third is of some, that change *do* into *si*; as *Cedo pro discedere sive locum dare cessi*:
Vado, vado, lædo, ludo, divido, trudo,
Claudo, plaudo, rodo, ex do semper faciunt si.

¶ *Ut*

¶ *ut mando mandi*] *Liv.* in *Odyſſ. Cum ſocios noſtros mandiſſet impius Cyclops.* By this teſtimony *Priſcian* proves *mando* to have anciently made *mandi*, not *mandai* nor *mandidi*, as ſome thought, which yet with him wants a Preterperfect tenſe. And however not only *Phocas*, but later Grammarians, *Voſſius*, *Farnaby*, *&c.* do allow of *mandi*, yet it appears by this, that it is a word rarely met withal: though *manſus* the Participle derived from it be more frequently found. *Cic.* 2. *de Orat. Atq; omnia minima manſa*, *ut aiunt*, *nutrices infantibus in os inferant.* So *Quint.* l. 10. c. 1. hath *cibos manſos*; and *Plin.* l. 26. c. 12. *Imponatur trita vel manſa.*

Sed ſcindo ſcidi dat] *Plaut.* in *Pſeud.* 3. 2. 42. hath *ſcindidi*: *Nam ego cicileadrum quando in patinâ ſcindidi.* Which yet *Obertus Giffanius* thinks ſhould be read *ſciſcidi*; and perhaps might rightlier be read *ſceſcidi*, in as much as in *Gellius* from *L. Attius* is read *ſceſciderat.* His words are theſe: l. 7. c. 9 *Præterea inveni a verbo*, *ſcindo ſimili ratione*, *non ſciderat*, *ſed ſceſciderat dictum eſſe. Lu. Attius in Sotadicorum libro primo ſceſciderat dixit*; *Verba hæc ſunt. Non ergo aquila ita*, *uti prædicant*, *ſceſciderat pectus.* But neither *ſcindidi*, nor *ſceſcidi*, no. *ſciſcidi* are now in uſe. Suffice it that theſe be noted (and ſo the reſt of like nature throughout theſe Tractates) in order to the reading of ancient Authours. Nor is it a marvel if *ſcindo* make *ſcidi*, which was it ſelf made of *Scido*, (derived of the Greek verb σχίζειν) by putting into it *n*, even as of *pago*, by the ſame interpoſition, was made *pango*, derived of the Greek παγεῖν of πήγω. *Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 26.

Pendo pependi] *Liv.* l. 5. d. 5. hath *pondiſſent* without the reduplication. *Dimidium ejus*, *quod regi pendiſſent.* But that now is out of uſe.

Tendo tetendi] *Tetendi* is found in *Sen. Here. Fur. Et quâ plena rates carbaſa tenderant. Propert.* l. 3. *Eleg.* 7 *At tibi qui noſto tendiſti retia lecto.* But that is not enough to make it paſſible now.

Cædo cecidi] *Cecidi* is put for *cecædi*: thence the

first

first *ce* short, and the second syllable *ci* long. *Juven. Sat.* 3. *Ebrius ac petulans qui nullum forte cecidit---*

Cedo pro discedere--- cessi] And yet in the *Pandects accedisse* is read for *accessisse*; the Ancients declining Preterperfect tenses after the manner of Present tenses, as *Vossius* notes, *Analog.* l. 3. c. 26.

Vado] The Preterperfect tense of this verb is hardly to be met with, but in the compounds of it, as *evasit* in *Cic. Catil.* 2. &c. Unless in *Tertullian* who l. *de Pallio* c. 3. saith, *Ea tempestate Oviidis, quâ ad illum ex Lybiâ Hammon vasit ovium dives.* For that of *Martial* as *Aldus* reads it, l. 12. *ep.* 5. *Arctatus labor est, & breve vasit opus*, others read *rasit*. And having no Preterperfect tense, it will have no Supine: Yet the compounds have both.

Appulcius hath *rudivi*, but that is not enough to exempt *rudo* from the Rule, especially since it may be of *rudio* of the fourth Conjugation.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule and exception declined?**

The Declining of the words

An. The words of this Rule, *&c.* are declined thus:

Mando, mandis, mandi, mandere, mansum.
Scindo, scindis, scidi, scindere, scissum.
Findo, findis, fidi, findere, fissum.
Tundo, tundis, tutudi, tundere, tusum & tunsum.
Pendo, pendis, pependi, pendere, pensum.
Tendo, tendis, tetendi, tendere, tensum & tentum.
Pedo, pedis, pepedi, pedere, peditum.
Cado, cadis, cecidi, cadere, casum.
Cado, cadis, cecidi, cadere, casum.
Cedo, cedis, cessi, cedere, cessum.
Vado, vadis, [vasi,] vadere, [vasum.]
Rado, radis, rasi, radere, rasum.
Lædo, lædis, læsi, lædere, læsum.
Ludo, ludis, lusi, ludere, lusum.
Divido, dividis, divisi, dividere, divisum.
Trudo, trudis, trusi, trudere, trusum.

Claudo,

Claudo, claudis, clauſi, claudere, clauſum.
Plaudo, plaudis, plauſi, plaudere, plauſum.
Rodo, rodis, roſi, rodere, roſum.

Qu. **Which is the Rule for the Preterperfect tenſes of Verbs ending in Go?**

An. The Rule for the Preterperfect tenſes of Verbs ending in *go* is this: *Go fit xi, ut jungo junxi.* *Go fit xi.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this, That if a Verb of the third Conjugation end in *go* in the Preſent tenſe, then the Preterperfect tenſe is formed of it by changing *go* into *xi*: as of *jungo* by ſuch change is made *junxi*.

Qu. **What Exceptions are there from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule there are two Exceptions.

Qu. **Which is the firſt?**

An. The firſt is more general, of all words, which have in them *r* ſtanding before *go*: for they change *go* into *ſi*: as our Authour ſaith. *---Sed R. ante go. vult ſi, ut ſpargo ſparſi.*

Qu. **Which is the ſecond?**

An. The ſecond is of ſome particular words which do change *go* into *gi*: and that either without any other alteration, addition, or diminution, as in *lego legi*: or elſe with ſome other alteration; as of *a* into *e*, as in *ago egi*; or addition of reduplication to the beginning, as in *tango tetegi*, *pungo*, which beſide the regular *punxi*, hath alſo *pupugi*, and *pango* or rather (as indeed it ſhould be) the old verb *pago pepigi*; or elſe diminution, as in *frango*, which beſides the change of *a* into *e* alſo loſeth *n* out of the middle, making *fregi*; and ſo *pango*, which, beſides the regular *panxi*, hath alſo *pegi*: for ſo our Authour

——— Et ago facit egi
Dat tango tetigi, pungo punxi pupugique,
Dat frango fregi: cum ſignat pango paciſci,
Vult pepigi, pro jungo pegi, pro cano panxi.

Go

¶ *Go fit xi*] So alſo *gio* in the compounds of *ſtinguo*, viz. *exſtinguo*, *diſtinguo*, *reſtinguo*, *exſtinxi*, &c. For the ſimple verb *ſtinguo*, though formerly uſed by *Martius* an old Poet in *Liv.* l. 25. *Namq; ollus dius ſtinguet perduelles veſtros*, as *Voſſius* reads it; and alſo by *Lucretius* and *Cicero* in *Aratea*, as *Priſcian* l. 10. ſhews it, yet as *Voſſius* ſaith of it, *pene exolevit. Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 27.

Dat tango tetigi] This is from the old Verb *tago*, Whence is *tagax*, ſaith *Voſſius*, *Etymolog.* p. 116. Hence *Plaut. Truc.* 2. 2. *Ne attigas me.* See *Quatuor his infra*, &c. in Conjug. 2.

Pungo punxi pupugique] Though *Punxi* be regularly formed of *pungo*, yet as ſaith *Alvarus* (p. 247.) *pupugi* is the ordinary Preterperfect tenſe, and *punxi* is hardly to be found, unleſs in the Verbs compounded of it.

Dat frango fregi] *Frango* is of the old Verb *frago*, whence *fragilis*: and thence it is *fregi*, and not *frengi* in the Preterperfect tenſe.

Cum ſignat pango paciſci vult pepigi] *Voſſius* plainly ſaith, *Inepte docent pango in præterito facere pepigi & panxi, cum tantum habeat panxi.* Whence then is *pepigi*? Why from *pago*, ſaith *Saturnius*, l. 1. c. 29. And ſo *Voſſius* expreſly. *Quare pepigi non a pango eſt, ſed a pago; pro quo poſteriores dixere paciſcor.* Which word *Priſcian* l. 10. cites out of *Cic.* l. 2. *ad Herenn. Pacta ſunt quæ legibus obſervanda ſunt: hoc modo rem ubi pagunt, oratione pagunt.* And it is to be found in *Quintil.* l. 1. c. 6. cited both by *Alvar.* and *Voſſ. Prima quoque aliquando poſitio ex obliquis invenitur, ut memoria repetô convictos a me, qui reprehenderant, quòd hoc verbo uſus eſſem pepigi. Nam id dixiſſe, ſummos authores confitebantur, rationem tamen negabant permittere: quia prima poſitio paciſcor, cum haberet naturam patiendi, faceret, tempore præterito pactus ſum. Nos præter authoritatem Oratorum, atque Hiſtoricorum, Analogiâ quoque dictum tuebamur. Nam cum in XII Tabulis legerimus Ni ita pagunt; inveniebamus ſimile huic caduni: unde non erit di-*

dubium, sic pepigi nos dicere, ut cecidi. Alvar. p. 247. *Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 27.

Pro jungo pegi, pro cano panxi] That *pango* hath *panxi* appears from *Colum.* l. 11. c. 2. *Olearum taleam operiet, cum panxeris, fimo & cinere mistis oblinere.* And that it hath had *pegi*, appears not only from *Pacuvius* cited by *Priscian*, *Tonsilam pegi laevo in litore*: but also from *Cic.* 1. *de Leg. Requiri placere terminos, quos Socrates pegerit*; where saith *Vossius*, *pegerit nihil aliud est quam panxerit.* But of this distinction of our Authours, *pro jungo pegi, pro cano panxi*, I see no ground. When *pango* is applied to *Verses* or *Poems*, as where *Cicero* saith to *Tiro*, *Pangis aliquid Sophocleum*, I suppose it refers to the *composition* of them, and not to the *singing*, and however in that sense hath no more propriety to this one Preterperfect tense, than in any other.

Qu. How are the words in this Rule and exceptions declined?

An. The words in this Rule and Exceptions are declined thus:

The declining of the words.

Jungo, jungis, junxi, jungere, junctum.
Spargo, spargis, sparsi, spargere, sparsum,
Lego, legis, legi, legere, lectum.
Tango, tangis, tetigi, tangere, tactum.
Pungo, pungis, pupugi, [& punxi,] pungere, punctum.
Frango, frangis, fregi, frangere, fractum.
Pango, pangis, panxi, [& pegi,] pangere, pactum.

Qu. What is the Rule for the Preterperfect of verbs ending in bo? *Ho fit xi.*

An. The Rule for the Preterperfect tense of Verbs ending in *bo* is this:

Ho fit xi, trabo seu traxi dacti, & vebo, vexi.

Qu. What is the meaning of this Rule?

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That verbs of the third conjugation ending in *bo*, do form their Preterperfect tense of the Present tense, by changing *bo* into *xi*, as of *trabo* by such change, is made *traxi*, and of *vebo, vexi.*

Q.

The declining of the words.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus: *Traho, trahis, traxi, trahere, tractum. Veho, vehis, vexi, vehere, vectum.*

Qu. **What is the Rule for the Preterperfect tense of Verbs ending in** *lo*?

An. The Rule for the Preterperfect tense of Verbs ending in *lo* is this: *Lo fit ui, colo seu colui.*

Lo fit ui.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That Verbs of the third Conjugation ending in *lo*, do form their Preterperfect tense of the Present tense, by changing *l* into *ui*, or *o* into *ui*: as of *colo* by such change, is made *colui*.

Qu. **Is there any Exception from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule are Excepted some particulars ending in *llo* [with two *ll*] which change *o* into *li*, either without any other addition, or change, as *Psallo psalli*; *fallo falli*; *vello velli*; which hath that, and whose compounds yet have *vulsi*: or else with some change, and addition, as *fallo fefelli*; *cello* (in the compound of it *percello*) *ceculi*, *pello pepuli*; For so our Author:

——*Psallo excipe cum p*,
Et fallo sine p, *nam falli format utrumque*:
Dat vello velli, *vulsi quoque fallo*, *fefelli*,
Cello pro frango ceculi; *pello pepulique.*

¶ *Psallo excipe cum p*, *& fallo sine p*] Both these verbs form *falli*: yet *falli* of *psallo* hath *p* before it in the Preterperfect as well as in the Present tense, say both *Danes.* and *Voss.* and before them both, *Alvar. Sallo facit falli sallum*: *dat psallere psalli*, saith he, pag. 247. Thence as *Priscian.* l. 10. cites *Sall.* l. 3. *Hist.* saying, *Parte consumta reliqui edituerum ad disturnitatem usus salterent.* Whereby *Sallo* of the third appears to be a distinct verb from *salio* of the fourth, so he also cites *Bassius* l. 2. *Lyricor.* saying, *Calliope princeps sapienti psalterat ore.* By which *Psalli* of *psallo* appears a distinct

distinct Preterperfect from *salli* of *sallo*.

Dat vello velli, vulsi quoque] *Velli* is in *Cic. 6. Verr. Tum illa ex patellis & thuribulis quæ vellerat, ita scitè & in aureis poculis illigabat.* But *Servius* denies any such word as *vulsi* to be read, though *Charisius* and *Priscian* give to this verb both *vulsi* and *velli*; who are followed by *Despauterius*, *Alvarus*, *Vossius*, *Richerius*, *Ramus*, *Farnaby*, *Burles*, *Hayne*, *Harris*, *Jasz. Berengie*, *&c.* Yet *Rhenius*, *Bird* and *Shirley*, take the part of *Servius*, and are only for *velli*. I suppose the difference may be easily compounded, the one side meaning that *vulsi* is not read in the *simple* verb; the other side, that it is read in the *compounds*. That *vulsi* hath been read, appears by the Participle *vulsus* derived from it, and used by *Livie*, l. 6. b. *Pun. Aræ, foci, deûm delubra, sepulchra majorum vulsa, temerata, ac violata.* So *Quintil.* l. 8. *Corpora siquis vulsa atque fucata muliebriter comat, fædissima sunt ipso formæ labore.* So *Martial. Mens est Pannice vulsa tibi.* And *Lucan*, l. 6. *Nox eget ingestis, sed vulsis pectore telis.* But yet that it is now in use, I yet see not proved by any example. Even *Vossius* himself when he goes to prove it by the Authority of *Ovid. Met.* l. 8. produceth but an example of *revulsi. A sylvis sylvas, & ab arvis arva revulsi.* Who elsewhere hath, *Aurea Phryxeæ terga revulsit avis.* Whence *Cic.* 13 *Phil. In quibus tu es, videlicet consularis, cujus totus Consulatus est ex omni monumentorum memoriâ revulsus*, or *evulsus*, as some read. And so *Lucan* is said to have *avulsit.* But still no example of the simple *vulsi.* When it appears, then let it be owned and used. And even in the compound *Cicero* is confessed by *Vossius* to prefer *velli*, which he useth *Attic.* 5. l. 20. --- *Honorificis, verbis omnes injurias revellimus superiores.* And l. 8. *Ep.* 15. *Quæ me convellerunt de pristino Statu.* And the use of the same in *Ovid* and *Virgil* is shewed by *Vossius* l. 3. *de Analog.* c. 28.

Cello pro frango ceculi] This Verb *cello*, which here

is

is said to have *ceculi* for its Preterperfect tense, and afterwards intimated to have *cellui*, where in the Rule for the Supines from Preterperfect tenses in *ui*, *cellui* is said to have *celsum*; I say this Verb *cello* is by *Alvarus* said to be utterly obsolete. The meaning then of our Authour herein is, not that *cello* the simple Verb hath *ceculi* or *cellui* (as if any of those words were to be used) but that the compounds thereof do form Preterperfect tenses, ending in those terminations. And indeed one of them, *viz. percello* hath *perculi*. *An. Perculit, & fulvâ moribundum extendit arenâ.* So *Plaut. Epid.* 4. 2. *Perij, plaustrum perculi. Ter. Eun.* 2. 3. *Perculeris jam tu me.* Of which verb yet the Supine is *perculsum*. Whence the Participle *perculsus* read in *Sall. Jug. Ita perculsa nobilitate post multas tempestates nova homini consulatus mandatur.* So *Lucan.* l. 7. *Gelidasq; in viscera sanguis Perculsa pictate coit.* As if it were from *percutio*, which some labour to establish from the Authourities of *Terence*, *Horace*, *Cicero*, and *Lucan*. But in all the cited places learned Criticks read *percussit*. But other compounds of it, as *antecello*, *excello*, *præcello* have *antecellui*, *excellui* and *præcellui*, for their Preterperfect tenses: from the two latter, whereof are formed the Supines *excelsum* and *præcelsum*, the former having no Supine. This Preterperfect tense in *ui* *Priscian* would have formed from verbs in *eo*, viz. *excelleo*, &c. and goes about to prove it from *Plaut.* and *Cicero*. And *Ausonius Popma, de usu Antiq. Locut.* l. 1. c. 11. names three places in *Cicero* for *excelleo*. *De Orat. In Oratoribus verò Græcis quidem admirabile est, quantum inter omnes unus excelleat.* ib. *Non quod sola ornent, sed excelleant.* and in *Læl. Quamvis licet excelleas.* But the more certain evidence is for *excello*, which beside what is said for it in Oratours, is evinced by that of *Lucret.* l. 1. v. 29. *Omnibus ornatum voluisti excellere rebus.* See *Vossius de Analog.* l. 3. c. 28. So then, what our Authour saith of *cello*, *ceculi* and *culsum* he means of *percello*: and what he saith of *cellui* and *celsum*, he means of *excello* and

præ-

præcello; and also of *antecello*, so far as it is capable of it.

Pello pepulique] Of *pello* they seem anciently to have said *pulsi*: whence regularly is the Supine *pulsum*, and thence the Participle *pulsus*. For so *Ulpian.* l. 70. *ad Edictum. Marcellus autem ait, si quis jus habens pecoris ad aquam appellendi, plura pecora adpulserit.* But now it is out of use. See *Voss. Analog.* l. 3. c. 28.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule and Exception declined?** The declining of the words.

An. The words of this Rule and Exception are declined thus:

Colo, colis, colui, colere, cultum.
Psallo, psallis, psalli, psallere, psalsum.
Vello, vellis, velli [& vulsi,] vellere, vulsum.
Fallo, fallis, fefelli, fallere, falsum.
[*Cello, cellis, cecuti, & cellui, cellere, culsum*]
Percello, percellis, perculi, percellere, perculsum.
Excello, excellis, excellui, excellere, excelsum.
Pello, pellis, pepuli, pellere, pulsum.

Qu. **What Rule is there for the Preterperfect tenses of Verbs ending in mo?**

An. For the Preterperfect tenses of Verbs ending in *mo* there is this Rule: *Mo fit ui, vomo ceu vomui.* *Mo fit ui.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That Verbs of the third Conjugation which end in *mo* do form their Preterperfect tenses of their Present tense by changing *o* into *ui*: as of *vomo* by such change, is made *vomui.*

Qu. **Is there any Exception from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule diverse words are excepted: As (1) One that changes *o* into *i*, viz. *emo emi*: (2) Four which change *o* into *si*, or (as we now corruptly write) *psi*, which are *como compsi, promo prompsi, demo dempsi, sumo sumpsi*: (3) One that changes *mo* into *ssi*, viz. *premo pressi.* So our Authour goes on——

Sed emo facit emi
Como petit compsi, promo prompsi, adjice demo
Quod format dempsi, sumo sumpsi, premo pressi.

¶ *Como petit compsi*] This and the other three words are written in their Preterperfect tenses, and so in their Supines with *p* interpoled, not only by many of our own Grammar Writers, as the *Authour* of the *Rudiments*, *Harris*, *Bird*, *Shirley*, *Hayne*, *Jasz-Bereugy* (if that learned English writing *Transylvanian* may be accounted ours) but also by Forraigners as *Risherius*, *Rhenius*, *Ramus*, yea, by *Alvarus* and *Despauterius*: and no marvel, since, as *Ramus* tells us, some in *Priscian*'s time, or before it, yea, and *Priscian* himself thought good so to write them, and that *Euphoniæ gratiâ*; and so in old Books ye may read *emptum* and *temptum*. But in the judgement of *Vossius* this faulty writing, done as he saith *vitiosè ac præter talium naturam*. *Etymolog.* p. 118. who also there tells us, that *Ter. Scaur. liv. de Orthographia* left out the *p*, and so did *Victorinus*: and according to this writing do both the *Gryphiaw*. *Gram.* and our own *Farnab.* and *Burles* write them: whose judgement and way I should prefer before the other, if obstinately corrupt custom would but permit us to take up the new *sumsimus*, and lay down the old *mumpsimus*.

Premo pressi] Yet *Cato*, as if the preterperfect tense of it were *premi* (or as loving, like some other of the Ancients, to keep the consonant of the present tense in the preterperfect tense) hath *premerint* formed from thence. *ubi factores vectibus premerint*. So he cap. 66.

The Declining of the words.

Qu. **How are the words in this Rule, and its Exceptions declined?**

An. The words in this Rule and Exceptions are declined thus.

Vomo, vomis, vomui, vomere, vomitum.
Emo, emis, emi, emere, emtum.
Como, comis, compsi, comere, comtum.

Sumo,

Sumo, ſumis, ſumſi, ſumere, ſumtum.
Demo, demis, demſi, demere, demtum.
Premo, premis, preſſi, premere, preſſum.

Qu. **What is the Rule for the Preterperfect tenſes of Verbs ending in no?**

An. The Rule for the Preterperfect tenſes of Verbs ending in no is this: *No fit vi.*

No fit vi, ſino ceu ſivi.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this, that of a Verb of the third conjugation ending in *no* the preterperfect is formed from the preſent tenſe by changing *no* into *vi*: as of *ſino* by ſuch change is made *ſivi*.

Qu. **Are there any Exceptions from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule there are four Exceptions.

Qu. **Which is the firſt Exception?**

An. The firſt is of one word which changes *no* into *ſi*, viz. *temno temſi* (corruptly alſo written *tempſi*.)

Qu. **Which is the ſecond Exception?**

An. The ſecond is of three words, which though they change *no* into *vi*, yet do admit of a Metatheſis, or tranſpoſition of the *r*, and vowel before that, which goes before *no* (and whereof the firſt alſo changes *e* into *a*) viz. *Sterno ſtravi, ſperno ſprevi, cerno crevi.*

Qu. **Which is the third Exception?**

An. The third is of one word, viz. *lino*, which beſids its regular preterperfect tenſe *livi*, forms two irregular ones, viz. *lini* and *levi*.

Qu. **Which is the fourth Exception?**

An. The fourth Exception is of *gigno, pono,* and *cano*, which in their preterperfect tenſes have *genui, poſui,* and *cecini*. So our Authour---

---Temno excipe tempſi
Dat ſterno ſtravi, ſperno ſprevi, lino levi,
Interdum lini, & livi; cerno quoque crevi;
Gigno, pono, cano, genui, poſui, cecini dant.

¶ *Sino ceu ſivi*] Anciently there was alſo read *ſini*.

Sed emo facit emi
Como petit compsi, promo prompsi, adjice demo
Quod format dempsi, sumo sumpsi, premo pressi.

¶ *Como petit compsi*] This and the other three words are written in their Preterperfect tenses, and so in their Supines with *p* interposed, not only by many of our own Grammar Writers, as the *Authour* of the *Rudiments*, *Harris*, *Bird*, *Shirley*, *Hayne*, *Jasz-Berenay* (if that learned English writing *Transylvanian* may be accounted ours) but also by Forraigners as *Richerius*, *Rhenius*, *Ramus*, yea, by *Alvarus* and *Despauterius*: and no marvel, since, as *Ramus* tells us, some in *Priscian*'s time, or before it, yea, and *Priscian* himself thought good so to write them, and that *Euphoniæ gratiâ*; and so in old Books ye may read *emptum* and *temptum*. But in the judgement of *Vossius* this faulty writing, done as he saith *vitiosè ac præter talium naturam*. *Etymolog.* p. 118. who also there tells us, that *Ter. Scaur. liv. de Orthographia* left out the *p*, and so did *Victorinus*: and according to this writing do both the *Gryphiani*. *Gram.* and our own *Farnab.* and *Burles* write them: whose judgement and way I should prefer before the other, if obstinately corrupt custom would but permit us to take up the new *sumsimus*, and lay down the old *mumpsimus*.

Premo pressi] Yet *Cato*, as if the preterperfect tense of it were *premi* (or as loving, like some other of the Ancients, to keep the consonant of the present tense in the preterperfect tense) hath *premerint* formed from thence. *ubi factores vectibus premerint*. So he cap. 66.

The Declining of the words.

Qu. **How are the words in this Rule, and its Exceptions declined?**

An. The words in this Rule and Exceptions are declined thus.

Vomo, vomis, vomui, vomere, vomitum.
Emo, emis, emi, emere, emtum.
Como, comis, compsi, comere, comtum.

Sumo,

Sumo, ſumis, ſumſi, ſumere, ſumtum.
Demo, demis, demſi, demere, demtum.
Premo, premis, preſſi, premere, preſſum.

Qu. **What is the Rule for the Preterperfect tenſes of Verbs ending in** no ?

An. The Rule for the Preterperfect tenſes of Verbs ending in no is this : *No ſit vi.*

No ſit vi, ſino ceu ſivi.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule ?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this, that of a Verb of the third conjugation ending in *no* the preterperfect is formed from the preſent tenſe by changing *no* into *vi* : as of *ſino* by ſuch change is made *ſivi*.

Qu. **Are there any Exceptions from this Rule ?**

An. From this Rule there are four Exceptions.

Qu. **Which is the firſt Exception ?**

An. The firſt is of one word which changes *no* into *ſi*, viz. *temno temſi* (corruptly alſo written *tempſi*.)

Qu. **Which is the ſecond Exception ?**

An. The ſecond is of three words, which though they change *no* into *vi*, yet do admit of a Metatheſis, or tranſpoſition of the *r*, and vowel before that, which goes before *no* (and whereof the firſt alſo changes *e* into *a*) viz. *Sterno ſtravi, ſperno ſprevi, cerno crevi.*

Qu. **Which is the third Exception ?**

An. The third is of one word, viz. *lino*, which beſides its regular preterperfect tenſe *livi*, forms two irregular ones, viz. *lini* and *levi*.

Qu. **Which is the fourth Exception ?**

An. The fourth Exception is of *gigno, pono*, and *cano*, which in their preterperfect tenſes have *genui, poſui*, and *cecini*. So our Authour---

---*Temno excipe tempſi*
Dat ſterno ſtravi, ſperno ſprevi, lino levi,
Interdum lini, & livi ; cerno quoque crevi ;
Gigno, pono, cano, genui, poſui, cecini dant.

¶ *Sino ceu ſivi*] Anciently there was alſo read *ſini*.

Thence *Ter. And.* 1. 2. *Sini, animum ut expleret ſuum.* So *Schrevelius* now reads it (though *Farnaby* reads *Sivi*) and ſo *Donatus* ſaith it was read *antiquè* who obſerves the Authour in *Adelph.* 1. 2. uſed *ſivit*, which ſome read *ſiit* (but that is but a Syncope for *ſivit*) and ſome manuſcrips *Sinit*, ſaith *Voſſius. Analog.* l. 3. c. 29. where from *Priſcian* he ſhews, that *Varro, Rutilius* and *Scaurus* ſo uſed it. Yet it may be better to forbear it.

Temno excipe tempſi] For the corrupt writing of *tempſi* for *temſi* ſee before, upon *Como petit compſi.* But the ſimple *temſi* it ſelf, and *temtum* derived thence are hardly, if at all to be found, as ſay both *Farnaby* and *Voſſius*: and accordingly *Alvarus* gives the Rule for it warily thus: *Dat tempſi temptum temno, ſi legeris uſquam*: yet not only *Jaſz-Berengi* and *Burles* and moſt other of our Engliſh Writers except *Shirley*, but *Rhenius*, yea and *Deſpauterius* confidently own them; I ſuppoſe becauſe they read *contemſi* and *contemtum* in the compound frequently. But that ſuch a preterperfect tenſe and Supine, as *temſi* and *temtum*, have been in uſe, not only the compound *contemſi* and *contemtum* doth, but the ſimple verbal *temtor* read (ſay both *Voſſius* and *Stephanus*) in *Seneca's Agamemnon*, ver. 599. would clearly ſhew, if that reading were unqueſtionably right, as indeed it is not, being in *Farnabies* edition of that Authour, not *temptor*, but *contemptor. Solus contemptor levium deorum. Stephanus* read it, *Solus eſt temptor levium deorum*; and from him *Voſſius*, I ſuppoſe, did cite it.

Lino levi, interdum lini & livi] *Levi* is read in *Hor.* l. 1. *Carm. Od.* 20. *Vile potabis modicis Sabinum Cantharis, quod ego ipſe teſtâ conditum levi*: and though both *Alvarus* and *Deſpauterius, Jaz-berengi* and *Harris, Daneſius* and *the Rudiment writer*, yea *Ramus* and *Riberius* own all the three *levi, lini*, and *livi*, yet *Voſſius, Farnaby* and *Burles* own no more but the firſt, *levi*: The *Cyphiſæ, Gram.* and *Hayne, levi* and *livi*: *Rhenius lini*

vel

vel levi; *Shirley levi* only in his Text, yet with *sivi* and *livi* referred to by an * in his margine. The matter I ſuppoſe, is, that as *Hayne* in his Margine notes, *livi* and *lini* were anciently uſed: and accordingly in *Colum.* l. 12. c. 50. we find *livi. Nova dolia vel ſeriæ craſſâ gummi liverunt*; and in *Cato* c. 69. *Si rectè liveris in dolium quinquagenarium cumini* p. 1111. *ſatis erit.* So *lini* in *Quintilians Declam. Caci Mariti inquit tui cruore parietem liniſti*: but that now they are grown out of uſe. Whereupon thoſe Authorities notwithſtanding, *Voſſius* ſaith, *Nullum vulgo ex hiſce præteritis probant: ſed levi.* He had beſides theſe three named another alſo, namely *linij*, whence *Varro*, *Cum oblinierit vaſa*, So *Colum.* l. 6. c. 8. *Partem allio tunſo, & ballicula linire*: but that he ſaith is from *linio* of the fourth. *De Analog.* l. 3. c. 29.

Cerno quoque crevi] All agree that *cerno* makes *crevi*, (though ſome look upon it as a word grown out of uſe, and therefore in their Rules rather uſe ſome compound of it, as *Farnaby decerno*; *and Hayne ſaith cerno Compoſitum dat crevi*, and that it doth ſo, when it ſignifies to *enter upon*, or *poſſeſs*, to *judge* or *determine* is not diſputed. For *Cic. Attic.* 6. 1. in the firſt notion ſaith, *Debet etiam fratris Appij amorem erga me cum reliqua hæreditate creviſſe.* In the ſecond notion *Plaut. Ciſtell.* 1. 1. *Cum ego antehac te amavi, & mihi amicam eſſe crevi mea Gymnaſium, & matrem tuam: tum id mihi aperiſtis, tu atque hæc.* Which words *Varro* repeating in his l. 6. *de ling. Lat.* adds immediately after them (and ſpeaking of *crevi*) that *valet conſtitui*: and thereupon ſaith, *Itaque hæres, cum conſtituit ſe hæredem eſſe, dicitur cernere, & cum id fecit, creviſſe.* Whereupon that in *Plaut. ciſtell.* 2. 1. which is ordinarily read, *Satin' tibi iſtuc in corde certum eſt?* *Scaliger*, that Gyant in Critical Learning, reads *cretum eſt*: And *Voſſius* ſaith, *Idem ſignificant cretum & decretum, quod conſtitutum, aut certum.* Whence *Salluſt. Orat. ad Cæſar.* ſaith *Equidem mihi decretum eſt, nihil tam*

ex alto reperiri posse, quod non cogitanti tibi in promptu sit. But whether it have *crevi*, when it signifies *to see*, that is said *pro*, and *con.* *Shirley* and the *Rudiment-writer* give it *crevi*, *cretum* in the sense of *seeing*, and *beholding*; and so the *Grammar* of *Gryphiswald.* But *Burles* saith, *cerno* to see wants the preterperfect tense and Supines: So *Farnaby Pro video caret præterito adeoque Supino.* So *Richerius*, *Cerno pro video, præteritum & Supinum repudiat.* So our Authour afterwards. *A video cerno vult vidi.* And so others: for saith *Vossius de Analog.* l. 3. c. 29: *Cerno tum tantum crevi & cretum facere aiunt, quando de hæreditate sermo est.* Yet saith he again, *contrarium evincit Priscianus illo Titinnij in Geminis: Simul ut pueras has noctu suspirare crevi.* i. e. *vidi* saith he, whence *Danisius Cerno pro video olim crevi.* And *Alvarus*, *crevi pro vidi, judicavi, usi sunt prisci.* And therefore *Rhenius* speaks more warily; *Cerno pro video ferè caret præterito & Supino.* So *Sebast. Duisburgens. Præteritum & Supinum verbi cerno extra compositionem rarenter leguntur: significat autem video*; citing that of *Plaut. Cistell.* 1. 1. for it. And so *Vossius* having in his *Etymolog.* p. 118. given it *crevi* and *cretum*, adds a note to shew in what sense he meant it, namely, *Cum sermo est de adeundâ hæreditate. Verum in videndi notione vix præteritum aut Supinum ejus reperias.* So that if the *Construer* of these Rules, and the *Translator* of this Grammar, had rendered this word by one of the other significations, rather than by [*to discern*] it had perhaps done better: unless their meaning were to intimate, not that the simple verb *cerno*, but the compound *discerno* did make that Preterperfect tense. And it may be best to forbear the use of it, till more weighty authority shall appear to justifie the so using it. See *Danes. schol. Edit.* 2. p. 234.

Gigno genui] *Genui* is ordinarily read, but rather from *geno*, than from *gigno*, which word was used by *Varro*, R. R. l. 1. c. 40. *Primum semen quod est principium genendi id duplex.* And ib. *Quadam enim*

ad

ad genendum propterea uſque adeo parva, ut ſint obſcura. So by *Lucret.* l. 1. *Aut erit ut poſſint in eo res eſſe, genique.* So by *Cenſorinus* c. 15. *Hic ſive quod ut genamur curet, ſive quod una genitur nobiſcum, ſive etiam quod nas genitos ſuſcipit ac tuetur, certe a genendo genius appellatur.* So by *Severus, Appuleius,* and many others of the Ancients, and not refuſed by *Paulus* and *Ulpian*, as *Voſſius* ſhews, *Analog.* l. 3. c. 29. though now it be diſuſed. And therefore *Voſſius* ſaith, *Gigno præterito caret, ſed mutuatur genui a geno;* and ſo *Farnaby* and *Rhenius* ſay.

Pono poſui] *Priſcian* out of *Plaut. Vidularia*, and *Appul.* in *Hermag.* ſhews that *pono* of old had *poſivi.* Whence in *Plaut. Aſin.* 3. 1. is now read, *Quin. pol. ſi repoſivi remum.* and *Caſin.* 4. 4. *Pene expoſivit cubito.* and *Curcul.* 4. 3. *Triginta minas quas ego apud te depoſivi.* Which *Catullus* alſo *Carm.* 35. hath *Quam mater prope Deliam Depoſivit olivam.* But 'tis now out of uſe.

Cano-cecini] *Servius* on *Georg.* 2 ſaith, *Sic etiam ab eo quod eſt cano, non cecini, ſed canui dicebant.* Thence *Sall.* as *Priſcian.* l. 10. teſtifieth, hat *Cornicines occanuere.* But now as *cecini* is the only uſed Preterperfect of the ſimple *cano*, ſo is *cinui* the only uſual termination of the Preterperfect tenſes of the Verbs compounded of it, *concino, incino, accino, occino, percino præcino, recino, ſuccino.*

Qu. How are the words of this Rule and the Exceptions declined? The Declining of the words

An. The words of this Rule and Exceptions are declined thus:

Sino, Sinis, Sivi, Sinere, Situm.
Temno, temnis, [temſi,] temnere, [temtum.]
Sterno, Sternis, ſtravi, ſternere, ſtratum.
Sperno, ſpernis, ſprevi, ſpernere, ſpretum.
Lino, linis, levi, [lini & livi,] linere, litum.
Cerno, cernis, crevi, cernere, cretum.
Gigno, gignis, genui, gignere, genitum.
Pono, ponis, poſui, ponere, poſitum.

Cano, canis, cecini, canere, cantum.

Qu. **What is the Rule for the Preterperfect of Verbs ending in** po ?

An. The Rule for the Preterperfect of Verbs ending in *po* is this : *Po fit pſi, ut ſcalpo ſcalpſi.*

Po fit pſi.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule ?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this : That verbs of the third Conjugation ending in *po* do form their Preterperfect of the Preſent tenſe by changing *o* into *ſi*, or *po* into *pſi* : as of *ſcalpo* by ſuch change is made *ſcalpſi.*

Qu. **Are there any words excepted from this Rule ?**

An. From this Rule are excepted two words : whereof the firſt is *rumpo*, which beſides that it loſeth *m* out of the middle, changes *o* into *i* [or *po* into *pi*] as *rumpo rupi* : the ſecond is *ſtrepo*, which changes *o* into *ui* (or *po* into *pui*) of *ſtrepo* forming *ſtrepui.* So our Authour :

——— *Rumpo excipe rupi ;*
Et ſtrepo quod format ſtrepui : crepo quod crepui dat.

Crepo quod crepui dat] Two Grammarians beſides our *Authour*, viz. *Deſpauterius* and *the Rudiment Writer* own *crepo* as of the third Conjugation. But for thoſe two I find twelve, that take no notice of it : and *Voſſius* and *Farnaby* are two of them : and ſaith *Daneſius*, *Crepo tertiæ conjugationis non lego. Schol.* l. 2. c. 11.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule and Exception declined ?**

An. The words of this Rule and Exception are declined thus :

The declining of the words.

Scalpo, ſcalpis, ſcalpſi, ſcalpere, ſcalptum.
Rumpo, rumpis, rupi, rumpere, ruptum.
Strepo, ſtrepis, ſtrepui, ſtrepere, ſtrepitum.

Qu. **What is the rule for the Preterperfect of Verbs in** quo ?

An. The Rule for the Preterperfect tenſe of verbs ending in *quo* is this : *Quo fit qui, ut linquo liqui.*

Quo fit qui.

Qu.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That of a Verb of the third conjugation ending in *quo* a Preterperfect tenſe is formed ending in *qui*: as of *linquo*, by ſuch change, and the loſs of *n* out of the middle, is made *liqui*.

Qu. **Is no word excepted from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule is excepted *coquo* which forms its Preterperfect tenſe by changing *quo* into *xi*. So that of *coquo* by ſuch change is made *coxi*. So our Authour:

—*coquo demito coxi*;

¶ *Linquo liqui*] Perhaps *liqui* might be made the Preterperfect tenſe of this verb, to diſtinguiſh it from *linqui* the Preſent tenſe of the Infinitive Mood Paſſive.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule, &c. declined?** The declining of the words.

An. The words of this Rule, *&c.* are declined thus (at leaſt in the compounds of this verb.)

Linquo, linquis, liqui, linquere, lictum.
Coquo, coquis, coxi, coquere, coctum.

Qu. **What is the Rule for the Preterperfect tenſe of Verbs ending in** ro?

An. The Rule for the Preterperfect of Verbs ending in *ro* is this: *Ro fit vi, ſero ceu pro plantо & ſemino ſevi.* *Ro fit vi.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That of a verb of the third conjugation ending in *ro* the Preterperfect tenſe is formed by changing *ro* into *vi*; as of *ſero*, by ſuch change, is made *ſevi*.

Qu. **Are there any Exceptions from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule there are five Exceptions.

Qu. **Which is the firſt Exception?**

An. The firſt is of one which forms *ro* into *rui*, viz. *ſero* in the other ſignifications that it hath, beſides that to *ſow*, or *plant*; as *ſero ſerui*.

Qu. **Which is the ſecond Exception?**

An. The ſecond is of two which form *ro* into *ri*; viz.

verro

verro verri, and *curro* (with a reduplication of *cu*) *cucurri*.

Qu. **Which is the third Exception?**

An. The third is of two which form *ro* into *ssi*; viz. *uro* which makes *ussi*, and *gero gessi*.

Qu. **Which is the fourth Exception?**

An. The fourth is of one which forms *ro* into *sivi*; viz. *quæro* which hath *quæsivi*.

Qu. **Which is the fifth Exception?**

An. The fifth is of one which forms *ro* into *rivi*, yet with the loss of its first vowel *e*, viz. *tero* which makes *trivi*. So our Authour having named *serui* for the example of the Rule, adds an Exception of the same Verb in another sense, saying——

Quod serui melius dat mutans significatum;
Vult verro verri [*& verſi*] *uro ussi, gero gessi,*
Quæro quæsivi, tero trivi, curro cucurri.

¶ *Quod serui melius dat mutans significatum*] Our Authour speaks as if it were the same verb, that made *sevi*, and *serui* whereas to *Vossius* it seems more probable, that they are two several latine verbs, derived from two several Greek verbs, *sero*, *serui* from σείρω *vincio*, and *sero sevi* from σπείρω or σπάω *sero*, the σ being left out. And as to *sero* signifying *to order*, &c. though diverse Grammarians as *Despauter*, *Bird*, *Rhenius*, *Shirley*, *Jasz-Berengi*, *Burles*, *The Rudiment Writer*, and *Gryphisw. Grammar* do positively give it a Preterperfect and a Supine, *serui sertum*, as if now in use: yet others speak more warily of it, as of a verb that anciently had that Preterperfect and Supine, and now only did retain it in the compounds of that Verb: Thus *Vossius*, *sero serui sertum antiquè*. Thus *Alvarus*, *Sero apud vetustissimos etiam serui fecit, ut ex Ennio & Catone constat apud Priscianum*; *Supinum sertum*, &c. Thus *Farnaby* having spoken of *sero* to plant, and coming to this *sero* saith, *In aliâ verò significatione compositâ serui sertum*. Thus *Mayne*, *Ro sit vi veluti sero vult pro semino sevi. At compositæ dabunt serui*

cum

cum significatum Mutant. Thus *Harris*, *sero serui sertum non usitatum nisi in compositis.* Lastly, *Danesius* saith, *Simplex autem serui sertum tunc utaris licet, quando apud classicum aliquem Scriptorem invenias. Scal.* l. 2. c. 11. It were to be wished, that the former sort had justified their assertion by some Authority: In the mean time till that be produced, it is evident that such a Preterperfect and Supine there hath been, not only by what is seen in the compounds of it, *assero, consero, insero, desero*, &c. which have *serui* in their preterperfect tense, and *sertum* in their Supine; but by *sertus* the participle remaining yet used in the simple: whence *Lucan.* l. 10. hath *coronas nardo sertas*, as *Alvarus* cites him; and also by the noun *sertum* a Garland, so called saith *Trebellius a sertis*, i. e. *digestis in vicem floribus frondibusque, ex quibus ab initio fieri coronae solebant.*

Vult verro verri & versi] In giving *versi* also as well as *verri* for a preterperfect to this verb, I find our *Authour* agreeing with *Despauter*, whose Rule for this is, *Verro ri, si, dato versum*: and *Harris*, and the *Rudiment Writer* agree with our *Authour*. But *Vossius* and *Farnaby*, *Rhenius* and *Jasz-Berengi*, *Richerius* and *Burles*, *Ramus* and *Hayne*, the *Gryphisw. Grammar*, and *Shirley* own no such preterperfect as *versi*. *Priscian* of old, as both *Vossius* and *Alvarus* tell us, saith that *verro* makes *versi* according to *Servius*, but *verri* according to *Charisius*, which, saith he, speaking of this latter, *usus comprobat.* And then from *Licin. Macer* cites, *etiam reliquias averrerunt*: and from *Publius*, *cellas servorum converri*, for the confirmation of it, I perceive that true which *Diomedes* saith, that it is no easie matter to find any Preterperfect tense of this verb. And though out of respect to the fore-named Grammarians, who deliver *verri*, though none but that, for the preterperfect tense of this verb, I presume, upon the account of what *Priscian* saith, I may allow of *verri*: yet of *versi* I shall conclude with *Alvarus*, *versi tunc licebit*

licebit utaris, cum legeris apud Classicos. So *he* pag. 249. *Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 30.

Tero trivi] Anciently *terrui* was used. Thence *Plaut.* in *Pseud.* 3. 2. speaking of Mustard-seed saith: *Priusquam teruerunt oculi ut exsilient, fecit*, as *Priscian* l. 6. saith *Plaut.* writ that, which latter Editions have *triverunt* And *Tibull.* l. 1. el. 4. *Aut operi insuetas atteruisse manus.* But *terui* is grown out of use, and *trivi* only remains. Insomuch that *Virgil*, as *Velius Longus* observes, when his verse would have given him way to have said *terui*, chose rather to say *trivi*, in *Ecl.* 2. *Nec te paeniteat calamo triviisse labellum.* So 2 *Georg. Hinc radios trivere rotis. Voss. Analog.* l. 3. c. 30.

Curro cucurri] *Tertullian* l. *de fuga in persec.* c. 12. hath *curri* without the reduplication. *Pedibus stetisti, curristi nummis.* But though he *run* before, yet I see no body follow after him, in this use of the simple Verb; yet many *concur* with him in the like use of some of the compounds of it.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

The declining of the words.

An. The words in this Rule, *&c.* are declined thus:

Sero (to plant) *serui, sevi, serere, satum,*
Sero (to set in order) *serui*, [*serui*] *serere* [*sertum*]
Verro, verri, verri [*versi*] *verere, versum.*
Uro, uri, ussi, urere, ustum.
Gero, geri, gessi, gerere, gestum.
Quaero, quaeri, quaesivi, quaerere quaesitum.
Tero, teri, trivi, terere, tritum.
Curro, curri, cucurri, currere, cursum.

Qu. **What is the Rule for the Preterperfect of Verbs ending in so.**

An. The Rule for the Preterperfect tense of verbs ending in *so* is this, So *velut accerso, arcesso, incesso, atque lacesso formabit sivi.*

So formabit sivi.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this, That of a verb of the third Conjugation ending in *so*, a Preterperfect tense

tenſe is formed by changing *ſo* into *ſivi*, as of *accerſo* and *laceſſo*, by ſuch change, is made *acceriſivi* and *laceſſivi*.

Qu. **Are there any exceptions from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule there are two Exceptions; The firſt is of one verb which turns *ſo* into *ſi*, viz. *viſo* which makes *viſi*; And the ſecond is of two verbs which turn *ſo* into *ſui*, viz. *pinſo pinſui*, and the old verb *depſo* which maketh *depſui*. *Sic viſo viſi, ſed pinſo pinſui habebit.*

Accerſo] The writing of *accerſo* for *arceſſo*, as if it were another verb from it, as our Authour here makes it, is by an overgrown errour (as *Voſſius* calls it) become ſo prevalent, that it will not readily be depoſited. Many Grammarians as *Alvarus*, *Voſſius*, *Ramus Daneſius*, *Farnaby*, *Burles*, *Shirley*, *Harris*, and the *Rudiment Writer* own no ſuch word but rather caſhier it. But what then, ſo long as our *Authour*, and *Richerius*, and *Sebaſt. Duisburgenſis*, and *Rhenius*, and the *Grammar of Gryphiſwald*, & *Hayne*, and *Bird*, and *Jaſz-Berengy* continue it? And not only ſo, but *Dictionaries*, and the extant Editions of Authours ſo have it: Hence *Ter. And.* 3. 3. as well in *Farnabies* as *Schrevelius*'s Edition, *Si in rem eſt utrique, ut fiant, accerſi jube.* So *Ad.* 3. 1. *Non adeſt, qui accerſat Æſchinum.* and *ib.* 4. 4. *Eo ne obſtetricem accerſat.* But ſuch a word as *accerſio* of the fourth conjugation there is (unleſs that alſo be a miſtake of *accerſio* for *arceſſio*, which alſo is read of the fourth conjugation.) *Liv.* l. 1. *de.* 3. *Placere itaque patrem accerſivi* (though *Voſſ. Etymolog.* p. 121. alleage that to prove *arceſſio* of the fourth, and read it *arceſſiri*) *Cæſ.* l. 5. v. *Gall. Ex continenti alios accerſiri jubet*, which yet again in other books is read *arceſſi. Sall. Jug. Metellos propere cunctos Senatorii ordinis ex hybernis accerſiri jubet. Id. ib. Tamen poſtremo Syllam accerſiri jubet.*

Arceſſo] This verb is now of the *third* conjugation: Thence *Sall.* in *Jug. Metellum omnibus concionibus capitis*

piris arcessere. and ib. *Quos pecuniæ captæ arcessebant.* But anciently it was of the *fourth.* Thence *Vossius Etymolog.* p. 21. cites from *Plautus, Arcessi hostias.* And thence *arcessiri* in *Livie*, as we noted before.

Incesso] I find two Grammarians agreeing with our *Authour* herein, and not excepting *incesso* from the Rule of turning *so* into *sivi*; They are Mr. *Bird*, and the *Rudiment Writer.* But the general current of Grammarians is against them, and for *incesso* to make *incessi.* So *Alvarus*, *Vossius*, *Richerius*, *Rhenius*, *Danesius*, *Farnaby*, *Burles*, *Harris*, &c. Again Authorities for *incessi* we have plenty of, both in *Alvarus* and *Vossius.* So *Cæs.* 3. *b. Gall. Exercitui quidem omni tantus incessit ex incommodo dolor. Liv.* l. 1a. *Pun. Ingens ipsum cupido incesserat Tarenti potiundi. Tacit.* l. 3. *Hist. Fuere qui uxorem L. Vitellii Triariam incesserant. Id.* l. 3. *Annal. Quoties valetudo adversa Flamixem Dialem incessisset.* But for *incessivi* I meet not with any one Authourity. And yet I am loth that this should passe as one of the *Errours* of *Lilly.* What then shall we say for *incessi?* Why, that it is a Syncopated Preterperfect tense, put for *incessivi*; first *incessij* being put for *incessivi*, and then *incessi* for *incessij.* Such *Syncopes* I find in other verbs of the same termination in this Rule. Thus *Liv.* l. 10. ab U. C. *Per biduum lacessière* (for *lacessivêre*) *hostem. Tacit.* l. 12. *Annal. Puguam manu capessiit,* (for *capessivit.*) *Ter. Phorm. in Prolog. Vetu' si poeta non lacessisset,* for *lacessivisset*) *prior.* So *Tacit.* 13. *Annal. Qui nondum honorem capessisset* (as of *capesii* for *capessivi.*) So *id.* l. 4. *Hist. Nulli unquam sub Nerone periculum facessisset* (for *facessivisset* of *facessivi*) as of *facessi.* And why may not all these places which are produced to instance that *incesso* makes *incessi* be Syncopated Preterperfect tenses, of the same nature with these? Assuredly *Vossius de Analog.* l. 3. c. 31. produces them upon that account. For having reckoned up some of them, he adds *Eſque istæc συγκοπὴ multo usitatissima in incesso* and then alledges *Columella* saying l. 12.

Pluvia

Pluvia inceſſerunt. Gellius in his li. 1. c. 2. ſaith, *In theorematibus tantum mugilibus, & puerilium ſagogarum commentationibus oblectantes objurgatione iſta inceſſuit.* Thence ſome gather as if *inceſſo* had made *inceſſui*. How much more probable is it, that through ſome miſtake, *inceſſui* was there read, if not for *inceſſivi* yet for *inceſſij*. And the rather becauſe *Ludovicus Carrio* in that very place reads *inceſſivi*. As the caſe is, though I ſhould rather uſe the uſed Syncopated Preterperfect tenſe *inceſſi*, yet I ſhould think not to uſe it otherwiſe than as a Syncopated preterperfect tenſe of *inceſſivi*, even like as *obit* is uſed for *obivit*. Yet this ſtill I ſay with humble ſubmiſſion to better judgements, and Authorities.

Atque laceſſo] That this verb forms *laceſſivi* in the Preterperfect tenſe is plain *Cic. pro Dom. Nos te Antoni nullâ laceſſivimus injuriâ. Id in Piſon. Reſponſione me inimicâ homo promptiſſimus laceſſivit.* But there are read Syncopated Preterperfect tenſes of it. *Liv.* l. 10. *ab u. C. Per biduum laceſſiêre hoſtem. Cic. Phil.* 2. *Tu ne verbo quidem violatus, ultro maledictis me laceſſiſti. Ter. Pherm. Prol. Vetus ſi poeta non laceſſiſſet prior.* Thence *Caper* reading in *Lucil.* l. 14. *laceſſiſſe* took *laceſſi* to be the Preterperfect of *laceſſo*. But the Supine of this verb, or rather participle derived from the Supine, ſheweth *ſivi* to have been the Preterperfect tenſe of it. *Tacit.* l. 4. *Hiſt. Nos quanquam toties laceſſiti, jure victoriæ id ſolum vobis addidimus, quo pacem tueremur. Claudian.* l. de b. *Get. Sæpe laceſſitam, ſed non impune fatemur Auſoniam.* All that can be ſaid againſt this, is this: That *laceſſivi* is of *laceſſio* of the fourth conjugation, and *laceſſi* of *laceſſo* of the third. Whereto I ſay, that ſuch a word as *laceſſio* of the fourth conjugation hath been in uſe. Thence *Columel.* l. 9. c. 8. ſpeaking of Bees ſaith, *ſolent novitate cœli laceſſiri.* But that it doth not follow, that this muſt needs be a Preterperfect tenſe of the fourth conjugation, becauſe it ends in *ivi*, unleſs all preterperfect tenſes of verbs of the third conjugation

tion that end in *ivi* be preterperfect tenses of the fourth conjugation which will not be granted, since *trivi* of *tero* was never pretended to be a preterperfect tense of the fourth conjugation. Though again I grant where the Supine of three or more syllables hath *itum* with *i* long, it is most probable. And if the case be so, as it is in this, and many more verbs, then it must be said that those verbs as they are now used, are each one verb made up of two, one of the third, and another of the fourth conjugation, both partly in use, and partly out of use, in use in the Present tense of the third conjugation, and preterperfect of the fourth: but out of use in the preterperfect of the third, and present tense of the fourth, unless in such verbs as retain both preterperfect tenses, which some do. And perhaps the same may be said of verbs of the fourth conjugation which have preterperfect tenses not in *ivi*, or other preterperfect tenses besides that in *ivi*; namely that what they have not agreeing with the Analogy of the fourth conjugation they have and retain from consignificant, sometimes used, but now disused, verbs of the third conjugation.

Sed tolle capesso capessi, Quodque capessivi facit] There was no great reason to except *capesso* from the Rule, any more than the rest. For this hath *capessivi* ordinarily. For *Cic.* l. 4. *de Rep.* cited by St. *Aug. de civ. dei* hath *Rempub. capessivit. Tacit.* 15. *Annal. Principium tam facinoris capessivere. Ib. pugnam manu capessivit.* Thence by a *Syncope* is formed *capessi* used by *Tacit.* l. 13. *Annal. Senatorij ordinis; sed qui nondum honorem capessissent.* Unless we will say *capessi* to be the preterperfect of this verb *capesso*, and *capessivi* the preterperfect of *capessio* of the fourth now disused.

Facesso facessi] *Voss.* gives this verb *facessivi* for its preterperfect tense, as well as *facessi*. And so *Farnaby* making *facessi* to be but a Syncopated preterperfect formed from *facessivi*. And so *Alvarus facesso itidem facessivi*. That of *Cic.* 1 *Ver. Ne profecto metuere intipiet, ne innocenti periculum facesseris, Priscian* witnesseth it

in ſome books was read *faceſsieris*, which muſt come from *faceſsivi*, and as *Alvarus* ſaith, *proprius vero eſt.* And it appears to be ſo, becauſe the Supine of this verb is *faceſsitum*, which both *Voſſius* and *Alvarus* inſiſt upon, urging for proof that of *Cic.* 6. *Verr. Antequam audiſſent ei negotium faceſsitum.* If this may not be admitted, becauſe *faceſsivi* is not punctually any where now read (at leaſt to my remembrance) then it muſt be ſaid, that as there is now *faceſſo* of the third conjug. whoſe preterperfect is *faceſſi*, whence *Tacit.* 4. *Hiſtor. Nulli unquam ſub Nerone periculum faceſſiſſet*; So anciently there was *faceſsio* of the fourth conjugation whoſe preterperfect tenſe was *faceſsivi*, from whence *faceſsieris* in the forenamed place of *Cic.* 1. *Verr.* if that were the true reading of it; and *faceſsitum* the only remaining Supine of this verb.

Sed pinſo pinſui habebit] This preterperfect tenſe *Probus* ſhews from that of *Pomponius*, *Neque molis moſui, neque pilis pinſui.* In which Authour is alſo read *condepſui. Partem inſipui, concluſi, condepſui*, i. e. from the ſimple *depſo depſui*, which *Cato* c. 90. hath more than once, ſaying: *Id ubi exoxeris, depoſito, bene oleo manum ungito, depſitoq; primum puſillum, poſtea magis depſes, oleo tangito, depſitoq;, dum fatere poteris turundas*— *Catullus* hath *perdepſui*, *Epigr.* 69. *Patrui perdepſuit ipſam uxorem.*

Qu. How are the words of this Rule, declined?

An. The words of this Rule, are declined thus: The declining of the words.

Accerſo, accerſis, accerſivi, accercere, accerſitum.
Arceſſo, arceſſis, arceſſivi, arceſſere, arceſſitum.
Inceſſo, inceſſis, inceſſi, inceſſere.
Laceſſo, laceſſis, laceſſivi, laceſſere, laceſſitum.
Capeſſo, capeſſis, capeſſivi, & capeſſi, capeſſere, capeſſitum.
Faceſſo, faceſſis, [faceſſivi &] faceſſi, faceſſere, faceſſitum
Viſo, viſis, viſi, viſere; viſum. *
Pinſo, pinſis, pinſui, pinſere, pinſitum, pinſum & piſtum.

† If *viſum* be not the only Supine of *video.*

Qu. **What is the Rule for the Preterperf. tenses of verbs ending in** Sco ?

Sco fit vi. *An.* The Rule for the preterperfect tenses of verbs ending in *Sco* is this: *Sco fit vi, ut pasco pavi.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That of a Verb of the third conjugation ending in *sco* the preterperfect is formed by changing *sco* into *vi*: as of *pasco* by such change is made *pavi*.

Qu. **Are there any Exceptions from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule are excepted three words; First *pasco*, which in the formation turns *sco* into *sci* with a reduplication of *po* in the beginning. Secondly, *disco* which turns *sco* into *ci* with the like reduplication of *di*. Thirdly *quinisco* which makes *quexi*; So our Author

——*Vult posco popposci,*
Vult didici disco, quexi formare quinisco.

¶ *Quexi formare quinisco*] Of this verb some Grammarians take no notice, that I find, in their Grammars: as *Vossius*, *Hayne*, *Farnaby*, *Burles*. Of those that do take notice of it, most read it *conquinisco*, and give it the preterperfect tense *conquexi*; as *Ramus*, *Alvarus*, *Richerius*, *Seb. Duisburgensis*, *&c.* Two agree with our *Authour* in reading it *quinisco quexi*, viz. *Shirley* and the *Rudiment Writer*. But whether we should read it *quinisco*, or *conquinisco* is the doubt. Of *conquinisco Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 25. brings an example out of *Pomponius*. *Ad eum ut conquexi, interim mulieres conspiciunt.* But of *quinisco* I find no example. Yet if *Rhenius*, *Duisburgensis*, and the *Gram.* of *Gryphisw.* say true, that there is *ocquinisco* as well as *conquinisco* (and indeed I find *Stephanus* quoting two places out of *Pomponius*, where *ocquinisco* is used; the one in *Prossibulo*, —*Nisi ipsius orans ultro qui ocquinisceret.* The other in *Pistore*. *Nisi nunc aliquis subito obviam occurrit mihi, qui ocquinisat*) then no doubt but *quinisco* is the simple verb, of which those two are compounded. I suppose they are all antiquated words, whence the above-named Grammarians give them

them no place in their Grammars: And it matters not much which of them is named. It may not be amiss to tell you from *Vossius*, what *conquinisco* means: and that (saith he) is, *secernuum inflectere, quod faciunt alvum exoneraturi: ac venit a conquinire, hoc est cunire.* Where by the way we may note, that it is rather a compound of *con* and *quinisco* put for *quinio*, or *cunio* than a simple.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule, *&c.* are declined thus:

Pasco, pascis, pavi, pascere, pastum.
Posco, poscis, popposci, poscere.
Disco, discis, didici, discere.
Quinisco, quinisis, quexi, quinistere.

The Declining of the words

Qu. **What is the Rule for the Preterperfect tense of Verbs in** to?

An. The Rule for the Preterperfect tense of Verbs ending in *to* is this: *To sit ti, ut verto verti.* *To sit ti.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of that Rule?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That of a verb of the third Conjugation ending in *to*, the Preterperfect tense is formed from the Present tense, by changing *to* into *ti*, as of *verto* by such change, is made *verti.*

Qu. **Are there any Exceptions from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule there are Excepted five words. First *Sisto* (taken actively for *to make to stand*) which besides the change of *to* into *ti*, takes in *t* before *i*, and loseth *s* after it, so that of *sisto* is made *stiti.*

Secondly *mitto*, which turns *to* into *si*, and beside loseth its first *t*, so that of *mitto* is made *misi.*

Thirdly *peto*, which turns *to* into *tivi*, so that of *peto* is made *petivi*, and of that again, by a *Syncope*, *petij.*

Fourthly *Sterto*, which turns *to* into *tui*, making in its preterperfect tense *stertui.*

Fifthly *meto*, which turns *to* into *sui*, and takes in *s* before *sui*, so that of *meto* is made *messui.*

So our Authour —— *Sed ſiſto notetur*
Pro facio ſtare activum, nam jure ſtiti dat.
Dat mitto miſi, petij peto ſive petivi.
Sterto ſtertui habet, meto meſſui.

¶ *Sed ſiſto notetur pro facio ſtare activum-*] *Siſto* hath two ſignifications: or rather there are two verbs of this denomination, the one *Active* ſignifying *to ſtop* or *make to ſtand*; and the other *Neuter* ſignifying to *ſtay* or *ſtand*: and the Active *ſiſto* hath a preterperf. tenſe of its own here named *ſtiti*: but the Neuter *ſiſto* hath no preterperf. of its own, but (*precarium habet præteritum ſteti* as *Richerius* ſaith) borrows *ſteti* the preterperfect of *ſto*; whence our Authour afterward, *A ſto ſiſto ſteti tantùm pro ſtare*. *Voſſius* diſtinguiſheth the preterperfect tenſes of theſe verbs thus: *Activum præteritum eſt* [*Antea illum illic ſtiti: nunc hic eum ſiſto:*] *At neutrum præteritum eſt* [*Antea illic ſtetit; nunc hic ſiſtit.*] *Etymolog.* p. 1122. And *Analog.* l. 3. c. 31. he gives examples of the Active ſignification from *Cato* in *Agell.* l. 2. c. 14. *Quid ſi vadimonium capite obvoluto ſtitiſſes?* and *Paul Furiſc. Ita ſtipulatus ſum, te ſiſti in certo loco, ſi non ſiteris.* And here, which is a wonder, *Grammatici non certant.*

Sterto ſtertui habet] Thence *Perſ. 6. Sat. Cor jubet hoc Enni, poſtquam deſtertuit eſſe Mæonides.* This verb ſaith *Voſſius*, *juxta aliquos ſterti facit*; and *Rhenius* ſaith it makes *ſtertui* and *ſterti*. But in *Alvarus* the Rule is exceptive to any thing elſe, but *ſtertui*. *Stertuit a ſterto tantum*, ſaith he. Neither do *Priſcian* or *Valerius Probus* own any other preterperfect but *ſtertui*. If any conteſt be, example muſt decide it: and till then I think we may hold us as we are, and be quiet.

Meto meſſui] I ſuppoſe the ſimple preterperfect of this verb is hardly, if at all, to be found, which made *Diomedes* and *Chariſius* give it for a verb wanting the preterperfect tenſe. But that it once had one, if at leaſt now it may not be allowed by them to have one, is evident by that of *Cato* l. 2. *de Origin.* cited by *Priſcian* l. 10. *In campo Tyburti, ubi hordeum demeſſuit.* Nor do the

the latter Grammarians quarrel about this.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?** The declining of the words.

An. The words of this Rule, *&c.* are declined thus:

Verto, vertis, verti, vertere. versum.
Sisto, sistis, stiti, sistere, statum.
Mitto, mittis, misi, mittere, missum.
Peto, petis, petivi, petere, petitum.
Sterto, stertis, stertui, stertere.
Meto, metis, messui, metere, messum.

Qu. **What is the Rule for the preterperfect tense of Verbs ending in** ecto?

An. The Rule for the preterperfect tense of verbs ending in *ecto* is this, *Ab ecto fit exi, ut flecto flexi.* *Ab ecto fit exi.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this, That of a Verb of the third Conjugation ending in *ecto* a preterperfect is formed from the Present tense, by changing *ecto* into *exi*: as of *flecto* by such change is made *flexi.*

Qu. **Are there any Exceptions from this Rule?**

An. There are no Exceptions from this Rule: only our Authour names two verbs, which besides the regular preterperfect tense in *xi*, have another in *xui*, namely *pecto pexi*, and *pexui*; and *necto* which hath *nexi* and *nexui.* So our Authour saith:

——*Pecto dat pexui habetque,*
Pexi: etiam necto dat nexui, habet quoque nexi.

Unto which Grammarians add *plecto*, which, they say, makes *plexui* and *plexi.*

¶ *Pecto dat pexui habetque Pexi*] *Pexui* was ordinary in *Priscians* observation: but *pexi* more rare, chiefly asserted by *Charisius*, by whom it was avouched from the Authority of *Mecænas* in his *Octavia. Pexisti capillum naturæ muneribus gratum. Asper* hath another preterperfect tense for this verb, namely *pectivi*; which perhaps he concluded to be from *pectitum* a Supine of it, having the middle syllable short; whence in *Columella* 1. 10.

the participle *pectitus*. *Verùm ubi jam puro discrimine pectita tellus.* and l. 12. *Præparatæ sunt & pectitæ lanæ.* But *Vossius* having said of this preterperfect tense, that he hath not yet found it in any good Authour, it will be best to let it alone. *Alvar.* p. 251. *Voss. Etymolog.* p. 131. and *Analog.* l. 3. c. 31.

Etiam nectо] *Nexui* is shewn from that of *Virgil. Æn.* 5. *Et paribus palmas amborum innexuit armis. Nexi* is shewed from *Lucil.* l. 5. *Hic solus vigilavit opinor, & cum id mi visus facere est, tum retia nexit.* So *Mecænas* in *Diomed. Nexisti retia lecto.* See *Danes. Schol.* l. 2. c. 11.

Plectо plexui & plexi] *Farnaby* gives both these preterperfect tenses to this verb (So *Burles*, so *Voss.* in his Grammar, So *Richerius*, The *Rudiment Writer*, & *Jasc. Berengie.*) Yet touching *plexi* he gives a note, that it gave that preterperfect tense *antiquè*, *Plectо plexui & antiquè plexi*, so he, and therein he follows *Priscian*, who gave the same note of it. Yet *Despauterius*, *Alvarus*, *Rhenius*, *Ramus*, the *Gryphiaw. Gram. Hayn.*, *Harris*, *Bird*, *Shirley* give it no other preterperfect but *plexi*. And of *plexi Priscian* himself gives an example out of *Lævius* in his *Erotopægnion. Capiti meo, trepidans, libens Insolita plexit munera.* But of *plexui* I see no example but one produced by *Voss.* out of St. *Hierome* in lib. Jud. c. 16. *Si septem crines capitis mei licio plexueris.* Whereupon he speaks of it by way of diminution, *Plectо plexui format, saltem in significatione implicandi. De Analog.* l. 3. c. 31. Which one would a little wonder at, that in his *Etymolog.* p. 121. should read, *Plexui nonnullis videtur esse a plectо quando significat implico, nectо: plexi verò quando significat pecto. Sed hoc discrimen non observatur. Partim eo differunt, quod plexui sit usitatius: plexi in usu esse desierit.* In such difficult investigations it is easie to mistake. *Vah, ecusen' hominem me esse? erravi.* So he in the Comedy. *Ter. Adelph.* 4. 2. Where Grammarians differ either from others, or themselves, Authority must carry it, if there be any, else it is best

to

to let all alone, at leaſt in my opinion.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus: The declining of the words.

Flecto, flectis, flexi, flectere, flexum.
Pecto, pectis, pexi, & pexui, pectere, pexum.
Necto, nectis, nexi, & nexui, nectere, nexum.
Plecto, plectis, [plexi & plexui] plectere, plexum.

Qu. **What is the Rule for the Preterperfect tenſes of verbs ending in vo?**

An. The Rule for the Preterperfect tenſes of Verbs ending in *vo* is this: *Vo fit vi, ut volvo volvi.* *Vo fit vi.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of that Rule?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That of a Verb of the third conjugation ending in *vo*, the preterperfect is formed from the preſent tenſe, by changing *vo* into *vi*, as of *volvo*, by ſuch change, is made *volvi*.

Qu. **Is there any Exception from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule there is one word excepted, namely *vivo*, which in the Preterperfect tenſe changes *vo* into *xi*, ſo that of *vivo* is made *vixi*.

Qu. **How are the words in this Rule declined?** The declining of the words.

An. The words in this Rule are declined thus:

Volvo, volvis, volvi, volvere, volutum.
Vivo, vivis, vixi, vivere, victum.

Qu. **What is the Rule for the Preterperfect tenſe of a Verb ending in xo?**

An. The Rule for the Preterperfect tenſe of a Verb ending in *xo* (if there were any need of any) might be this: *Xo fit xui.* *Xo fit xui.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of that Rule?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That of a verb of the third Conjugation ending in *xo*, a preterperfect is formed by changing *xo* into *xui*; as of *texo* by ſuch change is made *texui*: and ſo of *nexo* (if there be any ſuch verb of this conjugation) by ſuch change is made *nexui*: For ſo our Authour, *Nexo ut nexui habet, ſic texo texui habebit.*

¶ *Nexuo nexui habet*] Such a verb as *nexo nexui* is not to be read in *Richerius*, nor in *Gram. Gryphisn. Faynaby, Burles, Hayne, Bird, Harris, Shirley, Jaz-Berengie*, nor the *Rudiment Writer*. Notwithstanding *Ramus* and *Despanterius* own it. *Alvarus* saith, if ever it were it is now out of use. *Rhenius* saith it is in *Accius*, but now disused. *Vossius*, though in his *Etymolog.* he mention it not, yet in his *Analog.* l. 3. c. 35. he hath two instances of it, the one of *Attius* from *Priscian* and *Diomedes*, *Nos continuo ferrum eripimus, omnibus manica neximus*; the other from *Livius* in *Odyssea* cited in *Priscian* l. 9. *Nexebant multa inter se flexu nodorum dubia*. It may perhaps be best to allow such a verb as this of this conjugation, yet to look upon it as an antiquated verb, and forbear the use of it.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule, declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus:

The declining of the words. *Nexo, nexis, nexui, nexere, nexum.*
Texo, texis, texui, texere, textum.

Qu. **What Rule is there for the Preterperfect tense of Verbs ending in** cio?

An. For the Preterperfect tense of Verbs ending in *cio*, the Rule is this: *Fit cio ci: ut facio feci, jacio quoque jeci.*

Fit cio ci.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That of a verb of the third Conjugation ending in *cio*, the Preterperfect is formed from the Present tense, by changing *cio* into *ci*, and the *a* (if there be any) that goes before it, into *e*: as of *facio* by such change is made *feci*; and so of *jacio jeci*.

Qu. **Are there any Exceptions from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule two old verbs are excepted, namely, *lacio* and *specio*, which turn *cio* into *xi*; so that of *lacio* is made *lexi*, and of *specio*, *spexi*. So our Authour: *Antiquum lacio lexi, specio quoque spexi.*

¶ *Lacio lexi, specio quoque spexi*] These two verbs some

ſome Grammarians own without any note of their being antiquated, as *Harris*, *Shirley*, and the *Rudiment writer*. Others ſet them down but as obſolete verbs; as *Daneſius*, *Alvarus*, *Rhenius*, and *Duisburgenſis*. I ſuppoſe both do it for the ſake of the verbs compounded of them, to ſhew their compoſition and declining. Others not ſo much as mention them, but only verbs compounded of them, *allicio*, *aſpicio*, *&c.* as *Farnaby*, *Burles*, *Richerius*, and the *Gram. Gryphiſw.* I ſuppoſe this is becauſe, as is noted by Mr. *Hayne*, *Hæc ſæpe occurrunt compoſita, nunquam ſimplicia.* Old we find them, and as old let us leave them.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?** The declining of the words.

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus.

Facio, facis, feci, facere, factum.
Jacio, jacis, jeci, jacere, jactum.
[*Lacio, lacis, lexi, lacere, lectum.*]
[*Specio, Specis, Spexi, Specere, Spectum.*]

Qu. **What is the Rule for the Preterperfect tenſe of Verbs ending in** dio?

An. The Rule for the Preterperfect tenſe of Verbs ending in *dio* is this: *Fit dio di, ut fodio fodi.* *Fit dio di.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That of a verb of the third Conjugation ending in *dio* the preterperfect tenſe is formed from the preſent tenſe by changing *dio* into *di*: as of *fodio* by ſuch change, is made *fodi.*

Qu. **There being no Exception from this Rule, how is** fodio **declined?** The declining of the word.

An. Fodio is declined thus:

Fodio, fodis, fodi, fodere, foſſum.

¶ *Fodio fodi*] This verb hath alſo been of the fourth conjugation. Thence in *Colum.* l. 11. c. 2. *Runcari & adhuc fodiri poſſunt.* So in his *lib. de arborib.* c. 30. *Sed omnibus annis fodiri ante Calend. Mart. & interputari oportet.*

Qu.

Qu. **What is the Rule for the preterperfect of verbs ending in gio?**

Fit gio gi.

An. The Rule for the preterperfect tense of verbs ending in *gio* is this: *Fit gio, seu fugio, gi.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That of a verb of the third conjugation ending in *gio* the preterperfect tense is formed from the present tense, by changing *gio* into *gi*, as of *fugio* by such change is made *fugi*.

Qu. **There being no Exceptions from this Rule how is *fugio* declined?**

An. Fugio is declined thus:

The declining of the word.

Fugio, fugis, fugi, fugere, fugitum.

Qu. **What is the Rule for the preterperfect tense of Verbs ending in pio?**

Fit pio pi.

An. The Rule for the Preterperfect tense of verbs ending in *pio* is this: *Fit pio pi, ut capio cepi.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this, that of a verb of the third conjugation ending in *pio*, the preterperfect is formed from the present tense by changing *pio* into *pi*: as of *capio* by such change (with the change also of *a* into *e*) is made *cepi*.

Qu. **Are there any exceptions from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule are excepted three verbs: First, *cupio* which forms *pio* into *pivi*, as *cupio cupivi*. Secondly *rapio*, which forms *pio* into *pui*, as *rapio rapui*. Thirdly *sapio*, which forms *pio* both into *pui* and into *pivi*, as *sapio sapui*, and *sapivi*. So our Authour:

——— *Cupio excipe pivi.*
Et rapio rapui, sapio sapui, aque sapivi.

¶ *Cupio excipe pivi*] That is, *cupio* makes *cupivi*: *pivi* being by an *Aphæresis* put for *cupivi*. This verb anciently hath been of the fourth conjugation. Thence *Lucret.* l. 1.--*Confringere ut arctâ Naturæ primus portarum claustra cupiret. Ovid.* 3. *Fast. Mars videt hanc, visamquecupit, potiturque cupitâ.*

Sapio

Sapio ſapui atque ſapivi] Of the old Grammarians *Aſper* and *Diomedes* were for *ſapivi* and *ſapii*; *Charisius* for *ſapui*, or *ſapivi*; *Caper* for both; *Probus* and *Priſcian* for *ſapui*. The latter Grammarians moſtly are for *ſapui* and *ſapivi*, as *Deſpauterius*, *Alvarus*, *Voſſius*, *Rhenius*, *Farnabie*, &c. And there are evidences that *Sapivi* was anciently in uſe. So *Nævius*, *quanto ego plus ſapivi*, *quàm* —Thence in *Martial* l. 9. Ep. 6. *Nubere vis Priſco*, *non miror pauta*; *ſapiſti* for *ſapiviſti*. So *Plaut. Rud.* 4. 1. *Pol magis ſapiſſet*: *ſi dormiviſſet domi*. Thence in *Cic. Attic.* 4. 5. *Vix aliquando te auctore reſipivi*; and thence by contraction in *Ter. Heaut.* 4. 8. *Te intelligo reſipiſſe*. But for *ſapui* which many are only for, as *Richerius* and *Hayne*, and *Bird*, and *Shirley* and *Harris* (and of thoſe that are for both, ſome prefer it before *ſapivi*, as being more uſual; *ſapui tamen vulgo uſitatius eſt*, ſaith *Voſſius*; *ſapio nunc ſæpius quidem facit ſapui*; So *Duisburgenſis*. *Sapui videtur cæteris uſitatius*; So *Alvarus*. *Sapio ſapivi olim nunc ſapui*; *Gram. Gryphiſw.*) I ſee no example produced, but one out of *Plaut.* and that very ſame which we before produced for *ſapi*, by contraction put for *ſapivi*; which ſaith *Voſſius* according to the Edition of *Putſchius* is read, *Pol magis ſapuiſſet*, *ſi dormiviſſet domi*, who yet confeſſes *Camerarius* to have read it *ſapiſſet*, *idque ex MSS orum fide*. I ſuppoſe the frequent uſe of *ſapui* in the compounds of this verb, *deſipio*, *deſipui*, *reſipio reſipui*, *&c.* is the cauſe of the ones being ſo much preferred before the other by Grammarians, I ſay ſtill let uſe be umpire. To this verb ſome give two Supines, one with the middle ſyllable long, the other with the middle ſyllable ſhort, ſome give but one, not determining of whether form; and ſome again deprive it of both its having a Supine with *i* long in the middle, proceeds from a ſuppoſition of what *Diomedes*, cited by *Daneſ.* as a witneſs for it, thought (but without any proof from Authority, as *Alvarus* notes) that it was alſo of the fourth conjugation. And ſo *Duisburgenſis*; *Sapio ſapivi ſapitum*, *penultimâ longâ*; *quia olim fuerunt quartæ conjugationis*.

But

But saith *Alvarus*, *supitum media seu longa seu brevi non videtur usitatum*, and then 'tis best letting it alone unused, unless this liberty be so enlarged, that what hath been said by any one, may be said, and used by all; which yet the old Romans seem not willing to give way unto.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

The declining of the words.

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus:

Capio, capis, cepi, capere, captum.
Cupio, cupis, cupivi, cupere, cupitum.
Rapio, rapis, rapui, rapere, raptum.
Sapio, sapis, sapui, [& sapivi,] sapere, [sapitum.]

Fit rio ri.

Qu. **What is the Rule for the Preterperfect of Verbs ending in** rio?

An. The Rule for the preterperfect tense of verbs ending in *rio* is this: *Fit rio ri, ut pario peperi.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An, The meaning of the rule is this: That of a verb of the third conjugation ending in *rio* the Preterperfect tense is formed from the present tense by changing *rio* into *ri*: as of *pario* by such change, (with the change also of *a* into *e* redoubled with *p* the first consonant of the word) is made *peperi.*

¶ *Pario peperi*] This is said to have made *parii* anciently: but that, if ever it made it, was of *pario* of the fourth conjugation, one example of which *Varro* in his l. 4. de L. L. produceth out of *Ennius*, *Ova parire solet genus penneis condecoratum.* And another out of *Manilius*, *Latona pariit casto complexu Jovis.* I am apt to think rather, that *parui* was anciently a preterperfect tense of this verb, my reason is because *paritum* with *i* short, was anciently the Supine of this verb, from whence by a *Syncope* is made the present Supine *partum*; and that the *i* in *paritum* was short appears, because that vowel in *pariturus*, derived immediately from it, is short. So *Ovid. Lucinam novies, novies paritura vocavit.* Now this could not come from *parivi*, but from *parui.* But it is not a matter worth contending for, and so I leave it

it for every one to think of it as he liſteth.

Qu. **How is** pario **declined?**

An. Pario is declined thus: The declining of the word.

Pario, parui, peperi. parere, partum.

Qu. **what is the Rule for the preterperfect tenſe of Verbs ending in** tio?

An. The Rule for the preterperfect tenſe of verbs ending in *tio*, is this: *Fit tio ſſi geminans s, ut quatio quaſſi.* *Fit tio ſſi.*

Qu. **what is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this, that of a verb of the third conjugation ending in *tio*, the preterperfect tenſe is formed from the preſent tenſe by changing *tio* into *ſſi* (with a double ſſ.) as of *quatio* by ſuch change is made *quaſſi.*

Quaſſi, quod vix reperitur in uſu] Many Grammarians allow this verb a preterperfect tenſe without any hunching it: as the moſt ingenious Grammatical Poet, or Poetical Grammarian Mr. *Shirley*; So Mr. *Bird*, *Harris*, *Richerius*, *Ramus*, *Voſſius*, *Deſpauterius*, *Jac. Berengie*, and the *Grammar* of *Gryphiſwald*. Mr. *Farnaby* denies it any at all. *Quatio ſine præterito quaſſum*; So he. Others though they deny it not, yet deny it to be uſual, as *Sebaſtian Duisburgenſis*, and the *Authour* of the *Rudiments*. Others again, like our *Lilly*, ſpeak warily in the buſineſs, neither well allowing, nor yet peremptorily condemning it. *Præterito caret, ut Chariſius apud Priſcianum docet*, ſaith *Alvarus* ſpeaking of it. *Quatio, quaſſi, quaſſum*, which preter tenſe *quaſſi* is ſcarcely read, ſaith *Burles*. *Et quatio quaſſi, quod vix reperitur in uſu*, ſaith *Hayne*. *Quatio quaſſi quaſſum* (ſaith *Rhenius*) *unde quaſſus & quaſſo. Sed præteritum quaſſi in ſimplici vix legitur.* But if it be allowed a Supine, which *Farnaby* denieth not to it, that yet deprives it of a preterperfect tenſe, then ſure it ſhould have a preterperfect tenſe for that Supine to be formed from. And from whence but *quaſſum* can be derived *quaſſus*, both the participle (uſed in *Horace*, who l. 1. od. 1. hath *quaſſa rates*; and in *Ovid.*

Ovid. in *Ibin*, who there hath *membrâ quaſſa*; and in *Curt.* l. 7. *Hæc quaſſâ adhuc voce dixerat.* and in *Appul. Metam.* l. 9. *Delium multifariam rimis hiantibus quaſſum.*) and the Subſtantive (read in *Cic.* 2. *Tuſc.* though from *Pacuvius*, *Nam attrectatu & quaſſu ſævum amplificatis dolorem.*) And from whence but *quaſſi* can *quaſſum* be formed? It is to be ſuppoſed that thoſe that deny it, or ſpeak doubtfully of it, never read it, and ſo ſpake. But withal it may be hoped, that of the ſo many, as ſpeak peremptorily for it, ſome at leaſt, if not all, had example to juſtifie what they delivered, eſpecially conſidering of how little value a Grammarians word is, without an Authour to vouch it. If they had any, I wiſh they had given it us: If they had not, then, though no doubt they had reaſon yet to think it had ſuch a Preterperfect tenſe; yet it will be beſt for us, till authority appear to back, and bear us out, and make us bolder, to ſhrink in, and ſort our ſelves with the wary ones, who ſay with our Authour here, *quòd vix reperitur in uſu.*

Qu. **How is** quatio **declined?**

An. *Quatio* is declined thus:

Quatio, quatis, [*quaſſi*] *quatere* [*quaſſum.*]

The declining of the word.

Qu. **What is the Rule for the Preterperfect of verbs ending in** uo?

uo ſit ui.

An. The Rule for the preterperfect tenſe of verbs ending in *uo* is this, *Denique uo ſit ui, ut ſtatuo ſtatui.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That of a verb of the third conjugation ending in *uo*, the preterperfect tenſe is formed from the preſent tenſe, by changing *uo*, into *ui*: as of *ſtatuo* by ſuch change, is made *ſtatui.*

Qu. **Are there any exceptions from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule there are excepted three words. Firſt, one which forms *o* in the preſent tenſe into *vi* in the preterperfect, namely *pluo* which hath had *pluvi* for its preterperfect, as well as it ſtill hath *plui.* Secondly, two, which form *o* into *xi*, namely, *ſtruo*

which

which makes *ſtruxi*, and *fluo* which hath *fluxi*.

¶ *Pluo pluvi formatur*] *Plui* of *pluo* is ordinarily read: but *pluvi* ſeldom, yet ſometimes in old Authours. *Liv.* l. 5. dec. 3. *In Albano monte biduum continenter pluvit. Plaut. Menach. Prol. Nam rus ut ibat forte, ut multum pluverat!* Thence *Pluvia*. So that though *plui* be uſual, yet as *Alvarus* ſaith, *veriſimile eſt & pluvi olim fuiſſe uſitatum*. In favour of which ſeveral places have been produced out of *Livie*; but the latter and corrector books ſtill have *plui*, as *Alvarus* obſerves. *Pluvi* is thought both by *Voſſius* and *Deneſius* to be formed of *Pluveo*. And ſo let it be if the Reader think well of it, for me. The compounds of it all form *plui*.

Thus *luo* may be ſuppoſed formerly to have made *luvi*: both becauſe *Lucil. Sat.* l. 3. hath that tenſe. *Tantalus qui panas ob dicta nefantia luvit:* and becauſe thence is formed *diluvium, colluvies, interluvies*. Now, if any thing, it forms *lui*. Thence *Claudian* in *Paneg.* hath *luiturus*.

Fluo fluxi] Anciently it ſeems to have formed *fluvi*, whence was formed *fluvius*: but now it is out of uſe.

Qu. **How are the words of this rule declined?**

An. The words of this rule are declined thus: The declining of the word.

Statuo, ſtatuis, ſtatui, ſtatuere, ſtatutum.
Pluo, pluis, plui, [& pluvi] pluere, plutum.
Struo, ſtruis, ſtruxi, ſtruere; ſtructum.
Fluo, fluis, fluxi, fluere, fluxum.

And thus much of the Rules for the Preterperfect tenſes of Verbs of the third Conjugation.

CHAP. IV.

CHAP. IV.

Qu. What rule is there for the Preterperfect tenses of verbs of the fourth conjugation.

An. For the Preterperfect tenses of verbs of the fourth conjugation there is this Rule:

Quarta Conjugatio.

Quarta dat is ivi, ut monstrat scio, scis, tibi scivi.

Quarta dat is ivi.

Qu. What is the meaning of this Rule?

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That verbs of the fourth conjugation do form the Preterperfect tense of the second person of the Present tense, by changing *is* into *ivi*: as of *scio scis* by such change is made *scivi*.

Qu. Are there any Exceptions from this Rule?

An. From this Rule there are six Exceptions.

Qu. Which is the first?

An. The first is of *Venio*, which changeth *is* into *i*, making *veni*, and not *venivi*, in the preterperfect tense.

Qu. Which is the second?

An. The second is of *Cambio* (the old verb) which changeth *bis* into *xi*, making *campsi*.

Qu. Which is the third?

An. The third is of *raucio, farcio, sarcio, sentio, fulcio*, and *haurio*, which change *is* with the consonant before it (whether it be *c*, *t* or *r*) into *si*, making *rausi, farsi, sarsi, sensi, fulsi*, and *haust*.

Qu. Which is the fourth?

An. The fourth is of *sepio*, which changeth *is* into *si*, making *sepsi*.

Qu. Which is the fifth?

An. The fifth is of *sancio*, and *vincio*, which change *is* with the *c* before it into *xi*, making *sanxi*, and *vinxi*.

Qu.

Q. **Which is the sixth?**

An. The sixth is of *Salio* (to leap) and *amicio*, which change *is* into *ui*, making *salui*, and *amicui*. So our Authour,

Extipias venio dans veni, cambio campsi,
Raucio rausi, farcio farsi, sarcio sarsi,
Sepio sepsi, sentio sensi, fulcio fulsi,
Haurio item hausi, sancio sanxi, vincio vinxi,
Pro salto salio salui, & amicio amicui dat.

Qu. **What is the meaning of that Note annexed to the exception from this Rule**, viz.

Parcius utemur cambivi, haurivi, amicivi,
Sepivi, sancivi, sarcivi, atque salivi.

An. The meaning of this Note is this, that these seven words *cambio, haurio, amicio, sepio, sancio, sarcio,* and *salio*, have formerly had a preterperfect tense in *ivi*, which now is mostly, if not wholly grown out of use.

¶ *Venio dans veni*] But *venio* makes *venivi*, for which they rather used *venii*. Hence *Flor.* 3. 21. *Municipia sub hastâ venierunt.* Insomuch, that some Grammarians, *Richerius, Farnaby, Harris, &c.* give *venii* for the preterperfect tense of it.

Cambio campsi] Some Grammarians admit this verb without any scruple into their Grammars; as *Despaut. Gryphisw. Gram. Bird, Harris, Shirley, Jasz Berengi*, &c. Others again utterly reject it, so as in their Grammars not to make any mention of it; as *Vossius, Farnaby, Burles, Ramus, Richerius.* Others admit it into their Grammars, yet with a note of *Antiquation* upon it, as *Danes. Hayne*, and *Rhenius. Bebelius* as *Duuburgensis* saith, thinks this a barbarous word. *Charisius* disowned it not: Yet if you will hear the learned *Alvarus*, you shall then use it, *cum apud bonos autores inveneris.* Thence saith *Rhenius* is *campso as*, in *Ennius* i. e. *iter flecto.* I should rather think that came from the Greek κάμπτω, *inflecto, incurvo*: more likely it is that (what he saith) from thence should come *campsor* the Noun

i. e. *trapezita*, a banker or Changer of mony.

Raucio rausi] This word our Englisſh Authours generally admit of, as *Hayne*, and *Bird*, and *Shirley*, *Farnaby* and *Burles*, *Jaſz-Berengi* and the *Rudiment Writer*, who therein, as I ſuppoſe, follow *Priſcian* and *Deſpauterius*. But of *Tranſmarine* Writers many make not ſo much as mention of it, that I can find, as *Ramus*, *Gram. Gryphiſwaldenſis*, and *Richerius*, with whom agrees our Engliſh *Harris*, who therein follow *Phocas* and *Diomedes*, in whom is found no mention of it. *Priſcian* for *rausi* cites *Cicero*, ſaying in his 1 *de Orat. At Æſopum, ſi paulum irrauſerit, explodi*; which reading *Lambine* alſo follows. But that place, as *Alvarus* notes, is now adayes read, *Si paulum irraucuerit*; and ſo *Voſſius*, which as he and *Duùburgenſis* ſay, may be of *rauceo*: and accordingly *Alvarus* is poſitive in it, that the theme of that verb is *irrauceo*. *Eſt igitur prima poſitio irrauceo*, So he. Yet inaſmuch as *rauſurus* is read in *Lucilius*, for ſo he l. 19. *Reuſuro Tragicus qui carmina perdit Oreſte*, as it ſeemed to *Daneſius*, it may be gathered, that anciently *rausi* alſo hath been in uſe: but in regard *Phocas* and *Diomedes* did not admit of it, and none but ſuch doubtful, or antiquated Authority is alledged for it, whether it now may be uſed, may do well to be conſidered.

Farcio farſi] That this verb hath formerly had a regular formation, may be ſuppoſed, in as much as in *Cic.* 5 *Verr.* there is read, (and *in melioribus libris*, as *Voſſ.* ſaith) *farctum*, which is made of *farcitum*, and that formed from *farcivi*, whence alſo *farcimen*: but now in this (as in moſt things elſe right and wrong have changed names) the regular is grown irregular, and the irregular regular.

Sepio ſepſi] *Livie* in his l. 4. de 5. hath *ſepivi*. *Idem* (ſaith he) *cum munimentis ea ſepiiſſent*. *Daneſius* thinks the place miſread for *ſepſiſſent*. Yet *Voſſius* quotes the place without any ſuch cenſure; and ſo *Alvarus*, though *Rhenius* ſpeak ſuſpiciouſly of it, *Liv.* l. 4. de 5. *habet etiam*

etiam sepiissent pro sepsissent, quasi a sepivi, si scriptura mendo caret: So he, p. 224. But though Sr. *Hierom* on *Isab.* c. 5. be by *Vossius* cited for it, Yet I shall say with our Authour, *Parcius utemur.*

Fulcio fulsi] *Ovid in Deian.* hath this word, *Hercule supposito sidera fulsit Atlas.*

Haurio item hausi] *Priscian*, l. 10. cites *Varro* using *haurii* as of *haurivi.* Sc. l. 24. *ad Ciceron. Cum inde haurierint.* Thence *Appul.* in several places. l. 2, 3, 4. *Met.* hath *hauritum*; and thence *Juvencus* hath *haurituras*, as *Vossius* testifies. But, as *Rhenius* saith, *Haurivi, hauritum antiqua sunt.*

Sancio sanxi] *Sanxi* is now the usual Preterperfect of this verb. Thence *Cic. pro Flac. Prætor sanxit edicto, ne ex Asiâ frumentum exportari liceret. Id.* 1 *Cat. Si quis de servis supplicium quàm acerbissimum sanxerit. Id. in Tusc. Nec cerimonias violatas tam expiabili religione sanxissent, nisi*— But *sancivi* hath also formerly been used. Thence *Pomponius* in *Priscian, Sancierat jus utile civitati. Nizolius* quotes *Cic.* in his *Orat. pro Planc.* saying *leges, quas Senatus de ambitu sancivit*: But *Lambine* reads the place otherwise, *legibus ipsis, quas Senatus de ambitu sancire voluerit.* Perhaps it was so in *Nizolius* his Book. But howsoever it be with *sancivit*, it is confessed that *sancitum* derived from it is very ordinary. Hence *Cic. de Arusp. Responsi. Communi jure sancitum est. Id.* 1 *de Leg. Id quod ne fieret lege sancitum est. Id. de Offic. Sancitum est apud nos jure civili.*

Pro salto salio salui] That *salivi* was anciently the Preterperfect of *salio* to leap, as well as of *sallo* to salt, appears from that of *Virgil.* 2 *Georg. Mollibus in pratis unctos saliere per utres.* So *Priscian* read it of old, *Ramus* and *Farnaby* of late; and so *Pierius* witnesseth it was read in the old Books, and *Vossius* in his manuscripts; and even *Servius* confesseth that reading, though he say the Poet writ there according to *Art*, not according to *use*, which in his time was to write *salui.* The like is read in *Stat. Theb.* 9. *Excussi salierunt cuspide dentes.*

Whence no doubt, *Richerius* plainly delivers *salivi* for the preterperfect tense of this verb. And *Alvarus* plainly saith, *Salio etiam salii facit*, backing his saying with the aforesaid Authourity, though withal acknowledging a different reading in that of *Virgil* from the testimony of *Priscian*. *Salui* is now the more used Preterperfect of this verb. Thence *Ovid. Fastor.* 1. *Per flammas saluisse pecus, saluisse colonos.* Yet though *Despauterius* and two or three more of our English Writers give it no other Preterperfect but *salui*, yet *Vossius*, *Ramus*, *Rhenius*, *Farnaby*, *Hayne*, and others allow it *salii* as well as *salui*. Read what is written, use what is usual.

Et amicio amicui dat] There is great differing amongst Grammarians about this word. *Hayne* not excepting it from the general rule, is to be supposed to comprehend it under it, and to give *amicivi* for the preterperfect of it: and therein he is alone, as far as I see. *Shirley* gives only *amixi* for the preterperfect of it. *Despauterius*, *Richerius*, *Bird*, and the *Rudiment Writer* give it only, *amicui*. The *Grammar of Gryphiswald*. *amicivi* or *amixi*. *Rhenius amicivi* or *amicui* (as he meant, though it be written *amixi*; for he saith after, *Placet etiam nonnullis amixi*.) *Jasz-Berengi amicui & amixi*. *Ramus* and *Harris*, all three indifferently, *amicivi*, *amicui*, *amixi*. *Farnaby* and *Burles*, *amicui*, and sometimes *amicivi* and *amixi*. *Vossius amicui* and *amixi*, yet adding in his margine, that sometimes it gives *amicivi*: yet that *amixi* is more usual than the rest. And so *Alvarus* of the two, which he mentions, *amicui* and *amixi* prefers the latter before the former. Here we have Grammarians words and opinions. But where are their Authorities? Why, that of *Hor.* l. 2. *Ep. Et piper & quicquid chartis amicitur ineptis*, proves it of the fourth Conjugation: and so regularly it should have *amicivi*: and *Diomedes* cites *Brutus* saying in his *Laudat. Appij Claudij*. *Quæ te toga prætexta amicuit*? and *Varro* in his *Cynorrhetor*, saying, *Celerius*

Celerius mater amixit. And this is all I meet with from them. If theſe Authorities will ſerve your turn, you may uſe all, or any of them: if not, you may let any, or all of them alone. I ſhould prefer *amixi*, both becauſe it is better liked by the Learned *Alvarus*, and becauſe it is ſaid to be the more uſual by the Incomparable *Voſſius*: beſides, as *Alvarus* notes, it ſeems to hold ſome Analogy with *fancio*, and *vincio*, which make *xi*; and *amictus* both the Participle, and Subſtantive, are orderly formed from *amictum* the Supine, and that regularly from *amixi*. If any man upon other reaſons, or probabilities, will hold either, or both the other two, he may for me.

Sarcivi atque ſalivi] Of *Sarcivi* I meet not either Authour or Grammarian ſaying any thing, and therefore I think we may not uſe it, even *parcius*, as our *Authour* allows. And for *ſalivi*, that muſt be underſtood of it, as it is the preterperfect tenſe of *ſatio* to *leap* or *dance*, which, as was noted, is ſeldom read; but not of *ſalivi* the Preterperfect of *ſalio* to *ſeaſon* with *ſalt*, for that is the uſual preterperfect tenſe of this verb.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus: The declining of the words.

Scio, ſcis, ſcivi, ſcire, ſcitum.
Venio, venis, veni, venire, ventum.
[*Cambio, cambis, campſi, cambire, campſum.*]
Raucio, raucis, [*rauſi*] *raucire,* [*rauſum*]
Farcio, farcis, farſi, farcire, fartum.
Sarcio, ſarcis, ſarci, ſarcire, ſartum.
Sepio, ſepis, ſepſi, ſepire, ſeptum.
Sentio, ſentis, ſenſi, ſentire, ſenſum.
Fulcio, fulcis, fulſi, fulcire, fultum.
Haurio, hauris, hauſi, hauriré, hauſtum.
Sancio, ſancis { *ſanxi* / *ſancivi* } *ſancire* { *ſanctum* / *ſanctum* }
Vincio, vincis, vinxi, vincire, vinctum.
Salio, ſalis, ſalii, & ſalui, ſalire, ſaltum.
Amicio, amicis, [*amicivi, amicui, amixi*] *amicire, amictum*

Before we pass it may be noted that verbs in *io* are of the fourth Conjugation, except these of the *First*, *glacio*, *emacio*, *socio*, *crucio*, *saucio*, *calcio*, *nuncio*, *fascio* *catamidio*, *radio*, *hio*, *retalio*, *spolio*, *amplio*, *lanio*, *somnio*, *pio*, *strio*, *vario*, *decurio*, *centurio*, *succenturio*, *furio*, *basio*, *satio*, *vitio*; And these of the *Third*, *facio*, *jacio*, *lacio*, *specio*, *fodio*, *fugio*, *cupio*, *rapio*, *sapio*, *pario*, *quatio*, as *Rhenius* reckons them up. p. 220.

And thus far of the Rule for the Preterperfect tense of verbs of the fourth Conjugation.

CHAP. V.

Qu. HItherto we have spoken of the Rules for the Preterperfect tenses of verbs *Simple*: and are now to proceed to the preterperfect tenses of verbs *Compounded*. **what is the Rule for the preterperfect tenses of such Verbs?**

An. The Rule for the preterperfect tenses of compounded Verbs is this:

De compositorum Verborum Præteritis.

Præteritum dat idem simplex & compositivum, ut docui edocui monstrat.

Præteritum dat idem simplex.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: that the preterperfect tense of a verb, when it is compounded, is generally the same, that it had before being simple, the composition nothing altering it, in that respect. For as *doceo* being a simple verb makes *docui*, so being by composition made *edoceo* it makes *edocui*, receiving no alteration by its composition in respect of its preterperfect tense.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An.

An. The words in this Rule are declined thus: The declining of the words.

Dicco, dices, dicui, dicere, Dictum.
Edicco, edices, edicui, edicere, edictum.

Qu. **I perceive that this Rule is not so general; but that there are Exceptions from it: what do'h the first Exception concern, and which is it?**

An. Of the many Exceptions that there are from this Rule, the first concerns such verbs, as double the first syllable of the Present tense in their preterperfect tense, and it is this: ——— *Sed syllaba semper, Quam simplex geminat composto non geminatur.* *Sed syllaba semper.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule of Exception?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That those verbs which being simple have the first syllable of their present tense (wholly, or with some change of Letter) doubled in their preterperfect tense, have not that reduplication, when they are compounded. As for example: though *mordeo* being a simple verb do double *mo* in its preterperfect tense and make *momordi*, yet being compounded with *re*, and make *remordeo*, it doth not now double *mo* and make *remomordi*, but *remordi* only.

¶ There are one and twenty verbs which double the first syllable of their present tense in their preterperfect tense, *Four* of the *second* Conjugation, *mordeo, pendeo, spondeo,* and *tondeo*; and *seventeen* of the *Third*, viz. *cado, cædo, cano, curro, disco, fallo, pago, parco, pario, pedo, pello, pendo, posco, pungo, tango, tendo, tundo,* and of these the Authour is to be understood to speak in this exceptive Rule.

Qu. **Is this exception universally true? or are there not some words excepted from it?**

An. From this Exception there are excepted these three words *præcurro, excurro,* and *repungo*; and all the compounds of these four words *do, disco, sto,* and *posco* (according to our Authour.) *Præterquam tribus his.*

Præterquam tribus his præcurro, excurro, repungo,
Atque a do, disco, sto, posco, rite creatis.

¶ *Præcurro*] The preterperfect of this word is read with a reduplication in *Plaut. Stich.* 2. 3. *Sed ego citu huc præcucurri.* So *Amph.* 2. 2. *Tute ab navi aliâ vi clanculum præcucurristi.*

Excurro] The redoubled preterperfect of this verb is read in *Suet. Galb.* c. 18. *Cumque exteritus luce primâ Tusculum excucurrisset. Liv.* l. 1. *ab urbe. Quum plures igni, quàm ferro armati excucurrissent, cæde incendioque cuncta complent. A. Hirt.* l. 1. *B. Hisp. Circiter undecim equites ad aquatores nostros excucurrerunt.* But *excurri* is more usual.

Repungo] All the Grammarians I have, grant *repungo* to have *repupugi*: but not one of them gives an example. Perhaps because they thought it needless. Only *Vossius* from *Capers* distinguishing betwixt *repupugi* and *repunxi* (*voluit*, saith he, *repupugi esse vicissim punxi repunxi verò referri ad rationes*) though he allow of his distinction, yet gathers that the Ancients gave to the verb both these Preterperfect tenses. *De Analog.* l. 3. c. 19.

Atque a do] That those compounds of *do*, which are of the first Conjugation, as *circundo, pessundo, venundo, satisdo* have *dedi* (as well as *do* hath) in their preterperf. is not disputed: but whether *do* be declined with any reduplication. Mr. *Shirley* sees a reduplication in them, and saith they retain it. *Retinent geminationem.* So he p. 72. And so Mr. *Bird*, *Vossius* could see none therein. And I dare not presume to be more quick-sighted than he. And the like may be said of *sto*. And therefore saith he, *malè addunt do & sto; in quibus nullam geminationem cernere est. De Analog.* l. 3 c. 19.

Sto] Of the no reduplication in this word, and consequently not in the compounds of it, I have newly shewn the judgement of *Vossius*, who could see as far into a Milstone, as any man I ever met with. *Resto* a compound of this verb hath been used with a preterperfect tense according to the regular formation of verbs of the first conjugation. Thence *restaurit* in *Propert.* l. 2. *Eleg.*

Eleg. ult. But now it is out of use.

Qu. **But may not some other words be named besides these here produced, which have the reduplication of their simple verb in their compounded preterperfect tense?**

An. Besides the words here named, some other may be found to have had the reduplication of their simple verbs in their compounded preterperfect tenses; as *decurro, percurro, concurro, procurro, occurro, despondeo, detondeo, admordeo*, which all, except the first, are grown far, if not wholly out of use, as to the reduplication of the first syllable of their simple verbs in their preterperfect tenses.

¶ *Decurro*] *Cæs.* l. 2. b. *Gall.* hath *decucurri. Ad cohortandos milites, quam in partem sors tulit, decucurrit.* So *Sueton. in Ner.* c. 11. *Notissimus eques Rom. Elephanto super sedens per catadromum decucurrit. Curt.* l. 6. c. 14. *Eodem temporis momento ad Philotam decucurrisse. Tacit.* l. 2. *Annal. Restituit aram, honorique patris princeps ipse cum legionibus decucurrit.* Yet *decurri* is more usual. *Her.* l. 1. b. *Hisp. Complures ex superiore loco adversariorum decurrerunt.*

Percurro] *Hirt.* l. 8. b. *Gall. Cum omnes regiones Galliæ Cæsar percucurrisset. Cic.* 3. *de Orat. Faciles enim partes eæ fuerunt duæ, quas modò percucurri.* But *percurri* is most ordinary.

Concurro] *Cato contra C. Pison. Video hâc tempestate concucurrisse omnes adversaries:* as *Priscian* l. 10. testifies. But *concurri* is ordinary.

Procurro] *Priscian* l. 10. produces *Livie* saying in his l. 20. *Et si ferociùs procucurrisset.*

Occurro] *Gellius* l. 7. c. 9. quotes *Probus* noting *Elius Tubero* to have used *occurro* with a reduplication and saying, *Si generalis species occecurrit.* But that is now quite out of use.

Despondeo] *Plant. Trin.* 3. 1. *Tu istuc Stasime dixisti? nostrum herilem filium Lesbonicum suam sororem despondisse.* Yet in the next verse he hath it without the redu-

reduplication. *Cui homini despondit? Id. True.* ac. 4. Sc. *Egone tibi Dinarchus, cui illam prius, despondere?* But *despondi* is far more usual. *Ter. Ad.* 4. 7. *Quin jam virginem despondi.*

Detondeo] *Priscian* l. 9. cites *Varro* saying, *Detotonderat forcipibus, viticarpiferis.* And *Enn.* in *Annal.* 8. *detotondit* (or as *Vossius* rather thinks it should be read, *Deque totondit*) *agros lætos, atque oppida cæpit.* But *detondi* is the now used word.

Admordeo] *Gell.* l. 7. c. 9. cites *Plaut.* in *Aulul.* saying, *ut admemordit hominem!* though in *Tergeminis* he said neither *præmordi*, nor *præmemordi*, but *præmorsi. Ni fugissem, medium credo præmorsisset.* But in these wherein he is alone, he may be let alone.

Qu. **How are the words in this Rule declined?**

An. The words in this Rule are declined thus:

The declining of the words.

Præcurro, præcurris, { *præcurri, præcucurri* } *præcurrere, præcursum*

Excurro, excurris, { *excurri, excucurri* } *excurrere, excursum.*

Repungo, repungis, { *repupugi, repunxi,* } *repungere, repunctum*

Do, das, dedi, dare, datum.
Disco, discis, didici, discere.
Sto, stas, steti, stare, statum.
Posco, poscis, popposci, poscere.

Qu. **What doth the second Exception concern; and which is it?**

An. The second Exception concerns the compounds of *Plico*; and it is this:

A plico compositum.

A plico compositum cum sub vel nomine, ut ista Supplico, multiplico, gaudent formare plicavi. Applico, complico, replico, & explico, ui vel in avi.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That some of the compounds of *plico* do form only *avi* in the preterperfect tense, and some both *ui* and *avi.*

Qu.

Qu. **What compounds of** plico **do form only** avi?

An. Of the compounds of *plico* thoſe only do form *avi*, which in their compoſition either have any noun, as *multiplico, duplico, triplico*, or either of theſe two Prepoſitions *ſub* and *re*, as *ſupplico* and *replico*.

Qu. **What compounds of** plico **do form both** ui **and** avi?

An. Thoſe compounds of *plico* do form both *ui* and *avi*, which in their compoſition have any of theſe four Prepoſitions, *ad, in, ex*, or *con*, as *applico, implico, explico, complico*.

¶ *A plico compoſitum cum ſub vel nomine*] With ſome this diſtinction of *cum ſub vel nomine* is vain: becauſe they hold *ſupplico* not to be a compound of *ſub* and *plico* as our *Authour* ſuppoſeth, and *Richerius* affirmeth but a ſimple derived of the noun *ſupplex*. Hence the *Grypbiſw. Gram. Quæ a nominibus componuntur habent avi tantum & atum: ut duplico. Sic triplico, quadruplico, multiplico, ſupplico*. And juſt ſo *Rhenius*. But they ſeem to be in a miſtake, and our Authour in that ſeems to be in the right. For as *Voſſius* ſaith, *ſupplex non minus a plicare eſt, quàm duplex & multiplex, a quibus duplico, & multiplico, quæ ipſi, & merito quidem, reponunt iſter compoſita a plico. De Analog.* l. 3. c. 20.

Applico] Though this verb have both *ui* and *avi*: yet in the buſineſs of Navigation it is obſerved, that the preterperfect in *ui* is moſt, if not only, uſual.

Replico] On our Authours ſide herein the Grammarians generally do go. *Richerius* having excepted only *ſupplico*, addeth, *Reliqua autem, quæ ex Præpoſitione conſtant, duplex præteritum, & ſupinum habent, unum regulare, aliud extraordinarium*. So *Rhenius* declines *replico* with *avi* and *ui*. And therein they follow *Priſcian*, who ſaith, *Cum nomine compoſita facere Avi, cum Præpoſitione juncta utroque modo, ac ſæpius per ui efferri*: as *Voſſius* reports him, who therein diſſents from him. *Plin. Jun.* in his *Epiſt.* ſaith, *Quum ſæpius ille replicâſſet, tandem*

dem persuasit. Plin. Sen. l. 34. c. 8. *Menæchmi vitulo genu premitur, replicatâ cervice. Id.* l. 9. *Margine in mucronem emisso intus replicato.* But as *Vossius* saith, *replicui & replicitum vix puto invenire.* Upon which ground he had before reckoned up *replico* with those that only make *avi* and *atum*. And of his mind is, the glory of our English Criticks, Mr. *Farnaby*, unto whom, till good Authority be produced to the contrary, I shall subscribe. Instead of *replico* the Teacher, if he be so pleased, may put in *implico* (which all, I think, do without contradiction yield to have both *ui* and *avi*) and read the verse thus:

Applico, complico, ut implico & explico, ui vel i navi.

To be sure *implicui* and *implicitus* too is read every where almost. *Implicuit teneram succina gutta feram. Martial. Habet implicitam controversiam.* So *Cic.* 2. *Inv.* Thence *impliciturus* in *Ovid. Fast.* 5. *Sertâ, te testes implicitura comas.* And if *implicavi* be not so easie to find, yet *implicatus* is as common, if I may so say, as the high way. *Cæsaris familiares satis oportunè habent implicatos consuetudine* --*Cic. Fam.* 6. 12. *Nullis occupationibus implicatus deus. Cic.* 1. *de Nat. Deor.*

Et explico] *Vossius* in his *Etymolog.* p. 103. touching this word hath this note. *Pro interpretatum potius explicatum, quàm explicitum dixeris. Imò Cicero semper explicavi dicit. Meas cogitationes omnes explicavi tibi superioribus.* So he *ad Att.* l. 10. *Ep.* 6.

Qu. **How are the words in this Rule declined?**

The declining of the words.

An. The words in this Rule are declined thus:

Plico, plicas, plicavi, & plicui, plicare, plicatum.
Multiplico, as, avi, are, atum.
Applico, as, ui & avi, are, itum & atum.
Complico, as, ui & avi, are, itum & atum.
Replico, replicas, replicavi, replicare, replicatum.
Explico, as, ui & avi, are, itum & atum.
Implico, as, ui & avi, are, itum & atum.

Qu. **Which is the third Exception? and what doth it concern?**

An.

An. The third Exception concerns the compounds of *oleo*, and it is this:

Quamvis vult oleo simplex olui, tamen inde,
Quodvis compositum melius formabit olevi:
Simplicis at formam redolet sequitur, suboletque.

Quamvis vult oleo.

Qu. **what is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: that whereas the simple verb *oleo* forms *olui* in its preterperfect tense, some of its compounds form *olui* (like it) and some *olevi*.

¶ This difference may arise from this, that there was anciently *olo olis*, as well as *oleo oles*. Of *olo olis* that of *Plaut. Most.* 1. 1. is an instance, *Non omnes possunt olere unguenta exotica.* Where saith *Pareus*, it is *olere penult. brevi.* Of *oleo oles* the next words, *si tu oles*, are also an instance. But of either *olo* making *olui*, or *oleo olevi* it is hard to shew by instance; only so Analogie requires they should be like *colo colui, delo delevi*: and the different Preterperfect tenses of the compound words in *ui* and in *evi* make it probable that so they were.

Qu. **what compounds of** oleo **do form** olui?

An. Of the compounds of *oleo* these three *redoleo, suboleo*, and *oboleo* are said to form their preterperfect in *olui*: as *redoleo redolui, suboleo subolui*, and *oboleo obolui*.

¶ Of *redoleo* and *suboleo*, you shall hardly meet with any Preterperfect tense in any Classick Authour: whence some give them *evi* for their preterperfect tense, and some *ui*, which saith *Vossius* is the safer. But of *obolui* indeed there are examples. *Sueton.* in *Calig. Ille antidotum oboluisset, quasi ad præcavenda venena sua sumptum. Suet.* in *Vesp.* c. 8. *Maluissem allium oboluisses.* So *Plaut.* in *Amph.* 1. 1. *Hei! numnam obolui ego? Id.* in *Menæch.* 2. 3. *Obolui marsupinum hoc istuc, quod habes. Id.* in *Mostell.* 1. 1. *Obolusti allium Germana Illuvies.* Yet in *Casin.* 4. 3. he hath *obolevi. Di hercle me cupiunt servatum, jam obolui Casina procul.* So *Stephanus*

phanus reads it: though *Plantin*, *oboluit*; and so the *Basil* Edition. 1523.

Qu. **What compounds of** oleo **do** form olevi?

An. Of the compounds of *oleo* these do form *olevi*; viz. *aboleo*, *exoleo*, *obsoleo adoleo*, *inoleo*, *peroleo*, *aboleo abolevi*, *exoleo exolevi*, *obsoleo obsolevi*, *adoleo adolevi*, *inoleo inolevi*, *peroleo perolevi*.

¶ *Abolevi* is read in *Liv.* 3. *ab urbe. Cujus rei propè jam memoriam abolevere at. Tacit.* l. 4. *Illi quidem septuagesimum ante annum perempti, imaginibus suis noscuntur, quas neq; victor quidem abolevit. Exolevi* is in *Cic.* in *Sallust. Posteaquam ætas tua jam ad ea patienda, quæ alteri facere collubuissent, exoleverat. Obsolevi* in *Cic. pro Leg. Manil. Obsolevit jam ista oratio. Adolevit* is in *Cic. de Leg. Ratio cum adolevit atque perfecta est, nominatur rite sapientia. Adolui* hath been in use. For so *Varro* 3 *Rhet.* cited by *Priscian* l. 9. *Postquam adoleverit hæc juventus.* And thence *Adultus* as from *adolitus*. But it is now disused. And that distinction which some would make, as if *adoleo* to *grow* made *adolevi*, and *adoleo* to *burn* did make *adolui* is vain. For as *Varro* above used *adolui* in the sense of *growing*, so did *Attius Cassius*, as *Diomedes* quotes him, use *adolevi* in the sense of *burning*. So he in his second to *Tiberius*, *Sit est contrà Ægyptiis maximum sacrificium, ubi integrum auferem adoleverunt.* Thus of *inoleo* (which some Grammarians say is saftier used with *ui*) there is read in *Gell.* l. 12. c. 5. a preterperfect in *evi. Natura omnium rerum, quæ nos genuit, induit nobis insolevitque in ipsis statim principiis, quibus nati sumus amorem nostri & caritatem. Claud.* 6 *Consul. Honor. Et penitus totis insolevit Roma medullis.* So of *peroleo* (which is thought safelier used with *ui*) there is read in *Lucil.* l. 30. an example in *evi. Quis totum sic corpus jam peroleſſe bisultis.* Where *peroleſſe* is put for *peroleviſſe*. The preterperfect tenses of these verbs in *ui* then use, when ye have example for them. See *Voſſius de Analog.* l. 3. c. 23. and *Etymolog.* p. 106. *Richer.* fol. 62. b

Alvar.

Alvar. p. 241. *Rhen.* p. 176, 177. *Farnab.* p. 37. *Burles* p. 194. *Duisburgen.* p. 111. *Ram.* l. 2. c. 3. *Danef. Schol.* l. 2. c. 12.

Qu. How are the words in this Rule declined?

An. The words in this Rule are declined thus: The declining of the words.

*Oleo, oles, olui, olere, olitum, [& oletum] **
Redoleo, redoles, redolui, redolere, redolitum.
Suboleo, ſuboles, ſubolui, ſubolere, ſubolitum.

* *Saturnius* gives it both theſe Supines. *Voſſius* even of *olitum* ſaith, *Si modò olitum uſpiam invenitur* (how confidently ſoever others give it that Supine) *Sed antique & oletum fecit. Etymolog.* p. 106. So *Rhenius*, *Apud Priſcos etiam olevi oletum, unde oletum pro ſtercore*, which yet *Voſſius* declares to note *locum male olentem. Analog.* l. 3. c. 23. Though *Cato* de r. r. C. 6. hath it in another ſenſe, *Ager oleto conſerundo*, &c.

Qu. What is the fourth Rule of Exception about? and which is it?

An. The fourth Rule of Exception is about the compounds of *pungo*, and it is this: *Compoſita a pungo*

Compoſita a pungo formabunt omnia punxi:
Vult unum pupugi interdumque repungo repunxi.

Qu. What is the meaning of this Rule?

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That all the compounds of *pungo* do make *punxi* in the preterperfect tenſe (none of them doubling the firſt ſyllable of the preſent tenſe) except *repungo* which hath *repupugi* and *repunxi*.

¶ *Formabunt omnia punxi*] *Duisburgenſis* ſaith, but *pleraque faciunt xi*: Yet he names none that doth not make that; nor any that makes any thing other beſide that. *Bird* allows *compungo* as well as *repungo* to redouble the firſt ſyllable. But without example: I ſuppoſe herein he followed *Stephanus*, who declines it, *compungo, compungis, compupugi*. But gives no example of *compupugi* neither. *Voſſius* and *Farnaby* allow of *compunxi*, and *diſpunxi*; *Ramus* of *expunxi*; *Rhenius* and the

the *Gram. of Gryphiſw.* allows of all the three. And a
of *repupugi* and *repunxi*. But not one example of eith
of them do I find among them all. Yet it appears b
Priſcian] l. 10. that they both were anciently in uſe
and that *Caper* would have *repupugi* to be *viciſſi*
punxi, but *repunxi* to belong to reckonings, which di
ſtinction yet *Voſſius* calls *vanum commentum*. *De Ana*
l. 3. c. 19.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined**

The declining of the words.

An. The words of this Rule, are declined thus
Pungo, pungis, pupugi, [& punxi] pungere, punctu
Repungo, repungis {*repupugi* / *repunxi*} *repungere, repunctum.*

Qu. **What is the fifth Exception about? and which is it?**

An. The fifth Exception is about thoſe compound
of *do*, which are of the third Conjugation; and it is this:

Natum a do quando.

Natum a do, quando eſt inflectio tertia, ut addo, Credo, edo, dedo, reddo, perdo, abdo, vel obdo. Condo, indo, trado, prodo, vendo, didi: at unum Abſcondo, abſcondi——

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That thoſe compounds of *do*, which are of the Third Conjugation do make their preterperfect not in *dedi*, but in *didi*, as *addo addidi*, except *abſcondo* which makes *abſcondi*.

¶ *Natum a do quando, &c.*] This was needful to be added, becauſe thoſe compounds of *do*, which are of the firſt conjugation have *dedi*, like the ſimple verb, as *circundo, circundas, circundedi.*

Abſcondo, abſcondi] In this our Authour ſpeaks what is uſual; for anciently this verb alſo did form *didi*, as well as the reſt. Thence *Priſcian* l. 10. hath from *Plaut.* in *Carbonaria*, *Secundum ipſam aram aurum abſcondidi.* So *Sil. Ital.* l. 8. 38.—*Numicius illam Suſcepit gremio vitreiſque abſcondidit antris.* Thence *Cicero* 2 *Verr.* hath *abſconditus.* *Non obſcurum opinor* (ſaith he) *neque abſconditum.* And in 3 *de Finib. abſcondit.*

ſcondite. Ea nec acutiſſimè, nec abſcondità diſſeruntur. But *abſcondi* is now the uſual word. *Senec.* l. 3. *de Benef. Bello civili proſcriptum Dominum ſervus abſcondit.* Id. *de Conſol. Tumeſcentem uterum aurum. Gell.* l. 17. c. 9. *Epiſtolam ſcripſit ſuper rebus arcanis hoc modo abſcondiſſe.* See *Alvar.* p. 235. Thence is ſaid to be in the Supine *abſconſum* (though *abſconditum* be better, as being from *conditum* the Supine of *condo.*) *Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 26. *Farnab.* p. 38. *Daneſ. Schol.* l. 2. c. 12.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus: The declining of the words.

Do, das, dedi, dare, datum.
Addo, addis, addidi, addere, additum.
Credo, credis, credidi, credere, creditum.
Edo, edis, edidi, edere, editum.
Dedo, dedis, dedidi, dedere, deditum.
Reddo, reddis, reddidi, reddere, redditum.
Perdo, perdis, perdidi, perdere, perditum.
Abdo, abdis, abdidi, abdere, abditum.
Obdo, obdis, obdidi, obdere, obditum.
Condo, condis, condidi, condere, conditum.
Indo, indis, indidi, indere, inditum.
Trado, tradis, tradidi, tradere, traditum.
Prodo, prodis, prodidi, prodere, proditum.
Vendo, vendis, vendidi, vendere, venditum.

Abſcondo, abſcondis { *abſcondi* & *abſcondidi* } *abſcondere* { *abſconſum* & *abſconditum* }

Qu. **What is the ſixth Exception about? and which is it?**

An. The ſixth Exception is about the compounds of *ſto*, and it is this: *Natum a ſto ſtas ſtiti habebit.* *Natum à ſto ſtas.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That the compounds of *ſto* do generally make *ſtiti* in their preterperfect tenſe, (and not *ſteti* like their ſimple verb:)

as *persto, perstas, perstiti.* So *asto, consto, disto, exsto, insto, obsto, præsto, resto, substo.*

Q1. **Why do you say** generallie? **Is there any compound of** *sto*, **that follows the simple verb, and makes** *steti?*

An. There is one compound of *sto*, which makes *steti* as the simple verb doth, namely *circumsto*, whose Preterperfect tense is *circumsteti.*

¶ *Virgil. Georg.* 4. hath *Curvata in montis faciem circumstetit unda.* Thence though divers Grammarians take no notice of it, as neither *Vossius*, nor *Alvarus*, *Despauterius*, nor *Richerius*, &c. yet others do, and deliver *circumsteti* for the preterperfect of this verb: as *Farnaby*, *Hayne*, *Shirley*, *Burles*, *Rhenius*, and the *Gram.* of *Gryphiswald.* Which two last do also give *Supersteti* for the Preterperfect tense of *supersto*: Which verb though set down by *Stephanus*, *Trebellius*, *Cooper*, *Gouldman* without any Preterperfect tense, yet is found to have *supersteti* in *Sall. Jugurth. Deinde ubi unæ aut alteræ scalæ comminutæ, qui supersteterant, afflicti sunt.* Unless the word be better to be read divided *super steterant.* And if *circumstetit* in *Virgil* were read divided also (as it is not impossible but the Poet might write it) *circum stetit*, then the exception will run clear without any thing excepted from it.

Some of the Compounds of *Sto* have had *avi* in the Preterperf. tense. Hence *Propert.* l. 2. *El. El.* 34. *Nec si post Stygias aliquid restaverit undas. Ammian.* l. 31. *In quoque præstaverit.* Which word *Vossius* and *Rhenius* say is also in *Justin institut.* And so what is now in the printed copies of *Vegetius, de Re Milit.* l. 1. c. 1. *Hispanos viribus corporum nostris præstitisse manifestum est*, in many manuscripts was *præstasse*, as the same *Vossius* saith, *de Analog.* l. 3. c. 20. And whence indeed can *statum* in many of the compounds, as well as the simple verb, be derived regularly, but from *stavi*? But that preterperfect as well in the compounds, as in the simple verb, is out of use.

Qu.

Qu. **How is sto declined?**

An. *Sto* is declined thus:

Sto, stas, steti, stare, statum.

The declining of the word.

CHAP. VI.

Qu. HItherto we have spoken of the disagreement of verbs simple, and their compounds, in respect of their *Preterperfect tenses*: **Are there not some verbs, which being compounded, do also undergo some change in their present tenses?**

An. Besides those verbs, whose compound Preterperfect tenses do differ from their simples, there are others, which have some difference also being compounded, from what they are being simple, in the present tense.

Qu. **How many sorts of such verbs are there?**

An. There are two sorts of such verbs. *First*, some whose compounds differ from their simples both in the *Present* tense, and in the *Preterperfect* tense. And *Secondly* some whose compounds do differ from their simples in the *Present* tense, but not in the *Preterperfect* tense.

Qu. **How many sorts of verbs are there, that being compounded differ from their simples, both in the present, and preterperfect tense?**

An. Of such verbs as being compounded do differ from their simples, both in the present, and preterperfect tense, there are two sorts. First some, that *change* a Vowel, or Diphthong, *in* their first syllable. Secondly some, that *lose* a vowel *out* of their first syllable.

Qu. **How many sorts of verbs are there, that do change a vowel or diphthong in their first syllable?**

An. Of those verbs that do *change* a Vowel or Diphthong in their first syllable, there are three sorts. First, some that change it into *e*. Secondly some that

change it into *i*. Thirdly some that change it into *u*.

Qu. **Which is the Rule for them that change it into** e ?

An. The Rule for those verbs that change a vowel in their first syllable into *e* is this:

Mutantia primam vocalem in E.

Verba hæc simplicia. *Verba hæc simplicia præsentis præteritique, Si componantur, vocalem primam in* e *mutant*: *Damno, lacio, facio, fallo, arceo, tracto, fatiscor Partio, carpo, patro, scando, spargo, parióque.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That there are some verbs, which being compounded do change the vowel *a* in their first syllable into *e*, as well in the present as preterperfect tense: as *Damno* being compounded with *con* becomes *condemno*; and is declined *condemno, condemnas, condemnavi*: and so in the rest.

¶ *Vocalem primam in* e *mutant*] This in reference to the preterperfect tense, is to be understood of such verbs, as have not *e* already in the first syllable of it, as it is in *fallo* and *pario*, whose preterperfect tenses are *fefelli* and *peperi*.

Lacio] So it is in *delicio, illicio, oblicio*, if they be compounded of *lacio*, and be not rather derived from *delicio, illicio*, and *oblicio*, as *lacio* it self is from *lacio*. But *oblacio* keeps the vowel of its simple verb thorowout: if any such verb be read any where else but in the Bible. For *Stephanus* plainly saith of it, *Idonei Authoris testimonium desideratur*: and observes that in stead of it, *Virgil* said, *a lacte depellere*; and *Varro a mamma disjungere*. Yet some of our English Grammarians allow of it, as *Burles*, and *Harris*, and *Farnaby*, it is to be hoped, upon good Authority.

Arceo] As *exerceo*, and *coerceo*. Yet *abarceo* keeps the *a*, as *Burles* hath it; some saith *Stephanus* turn it into

into *e*, and read it *aberceo* : the former seems more probable.

Tracto] As *contrecto*, *detrecto*. Yet, though some Grammarians are not pleased to make Exceptions of them, as *Harris* and *Shirley*, *pertracto* and *retracto* keep *a*, at least *often*, if not *alwaies*. Hence *Cic. de Invent. Si gesti negotii, & suam, & adversarii narrationem sæpe & diligenter pertractabit. Virg.* 12. *Æn. Nihil est quod dicta retractent. Hor.* 2 *Carm. Od.* 1. *Sed ne relictis, Musa procax jocis Ceæ retractes munera næniæ. Senec. Ep.* 110. *Si eadem, quamvis sciat, retractaverit.* Yea in *Gell.* l. 12. c. 1. Where in the Text is read *detrectandam*, there is a note in the margine, intimating that in old Books it was read *detractandam*.

Fatiscor] As *defetiscor*. Hence *Ter. Phor.* 4. 1. *Neque adeo defetiscor unquam experirier.* Yet in *Plin.* l. 17. c. 2. is read *defatiscentes*. And in *Castellio*'s Edition of *Kempis.* l. 1. c. 19. *defathiscitur* (I suppose by misprint for *defatiscitur*.) *Priscian* l. 10. owns *defetiscor*, but without preterperfect tense.

Partio] As *impertio*, *dispertio*. Yet though few Grammarians take notice thereof, except *Hayne*, *Farnaby* and *Burles*, *impartio* and *dispartio* are also read. *Cic. de Am. ut si quam virtutis præstantiam consecuti sunt, impartiant cum suis. Plaut. Aul.* 2. 1. *Edixit mihi, ut dispartirem obsonium hîc bifariam. Cic. ut fortunas nostras dispartiat parricidis.* So also are read *impartior* and *dispartior*. *Cic. pro Sext. Rosc. Commoda quibus utimur, a deo nobis dari, atque impartiri videmus. Plin. in Ep. Perire omne tempus arbitrabatur, quod studiis non impartiretur. Cic. de Leg. Jureconsulti, quod positum est in unâ cogitatione, id in infinita dispartiuntur. Id.* 3. *de N. Deor. Iidem vultis a diis immortalibus hominibus dispartiri, ac dividi somnia.* But I conceive *impertio* and *dispertio* the more usual. *Ter. Eun.* 2. 2. *Plurimâ salute Parmenonem summum suum impertit*

Gnatho. Cic. 3. Catil. Atque etiam viro forti Colleg meo. C. Antonio laus impertitur. Plaut. Aul. 2. Injuriâ dispertivisti, pinguiorem agnum isti habeo Id. Rseud. 1. 5. Populo viritim dispertirier. Mr. *Burles* addes *bipertio*, and *quadripertio*. I find *bipartio*, *bipartior*, and *bipertior*, *quadripartior* and *quadripertior*, *bipartitus* and *quadripartitus*, both in *Dictionaries* and *Authours*: but *bipertio*. and *quadripertio*, Not so much as in the Dictionaries of *Stephanus*, *Nizolius*, *Cooper*, or *Gouldman*. Which last only hath *bipartio*. Perhaps later and better Editions of Authours have those words, as he reads them.

Scando] As *conscendo*, *descendo*; which latter word anciently in its preterperfect tense had *descendidi*. Thence *Valerius Antiates*, *Deinde funere locato, a forum descendidit. So Laberius, Ego mirabar quomodo mamma mihi discendiderant. Gell.* l. 7. c. 9. But the preterperfect is now obsolete.

Spargo] As *conspergo*, *aspergo*, *inspergo*, *perspergo*, *prospergo*, *respergo*, *circumspergo*. But Mr. *Burles* excepts *præspargo*. And so indeed in *Lucret.* l. 15. it is read *Flora quibus mater præspargens ante viai Cuncta coloribus egregiis & odoribus implet. Gouldman* and *Stephanus* have *superspargo* as well as *superspergo*: of the latter I find an example in *Cato, de R. R.* c. 54. *Stramentum tecte condito, & sale superspergito*; Of the former as yet no example.

Qu. There is a Note annexed to the Rule, touching the compounds of *Pario* (viz. ——*Parioque Cujus nata peri duo comperit, & reperit dant: Cætera sed perui; velut hæc aperire operire.*) what is the meaning of that Note?

Cujus nata peri duo

An. The Meaning of that Note or rule touching the compounds of *Pario* is this: That of the compounds of *Pario* there be two, namely *comperio* and *reperio*, which have *Peri* in the preterperfect tense, whereas all the rest have *Perui*.

Qu.

Qu. **What is the meaning of that note also annexed to the Rule, touching the compounds of** pasco, viz.

A pasco pavi tantum compósita notentur.
Hæc duo compesco, dispesco pescui habere:
Cætera, ut epasco, servabunt simplicis usum.

A Pasco Pavi.

An. The meaning of that Note or Exception from the Rule touching the compounds of *Pasco* is this: That two compounds of *Pasco*, namely *compesco* to restrain, and *dispesco* to drive away beasts from pasture, do change their first vowel into *e*, and make *pescui* in their preterperfect tense, as *compesco, compescis, compescui*; *dispesco, dispescis, dispescui*: but that all the rest of the compounds of that verb, do follow the simple verb, and keep its first vowel and declining, as *epasco, epascis, epavi.* So *depasco, depascis, depavi*, to eat up or to feed beasts in a pasture.

¶ *Compesco*, Though *compesco* to restrain, *bridle*, refrain, or *keep in*, differ from the simple verb, yet *compasco* to *feed* together agrees with it, as both *Burles* and *Stephanus* decline it. Thence *Plin.* l. 9. c. 54. hath *compascere. Var. de* r. r. l. 1. c. 53. *compasci.* and *Stæv. l. c. Plures saltum communem, ut jus compascendi haberent mercati sunt. Cic. in Top. Si compascuus ager est, jus est compascere.* So though *depasco* to *eat up* do follow the simple verb; yet *depesco* to *drive away* cattel suits in *form* with *dispesco*, as well as in *sense*, and is to be found in *Gouldman*, though from what *Authour* I know not, because he names none: nor do I find it elsewhere.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule and the Notes annexed thereto declined?**

An. The words of this Rule and Notes annexed thereto are declined thus:

damno, damnas, damnavi, damnare, damnatum.
Lacto, lactas, lactavi, lactare, lactatum.
Sacro, sacras, sacravi, sacrare, sacratum.
Fallo, fallis, fefelli, fallere, falsum.

The Declining of the words.

Arceo, arces, arcui, arcere,
Tracto, tractas, tractavi, tractare, tractatum.
Fatiſcor, fatiſceris, —— fatiſci ——.
Partio, partis, partivi, partire, partitum.
Carpo, carpis, carpſi, carpere, carptum.
Patro, patras, patravi, patrare, patratum.
Scando, ſcandis, ſcandi, ſcandere, ſcanſum.
Spargo, ſpargis, ſparſi, ſpargere, ſparſum.
Pario, paris, peperi, parere, partum.
Comperio, comperis, comperi, comperire, compertum
Reperio, reperis, reperi, reperire, repertum.
Aperio, aperis, aperui, aperire, apertum.
Operio, operis, operui, operire, opertum.
Paſco, paſcis, pavi, paſcere, paſtum.
Compeſco, compeſcis, compeſcui, compeſcere.
Diſpeſco, diſpeſcis, diſpeſcui, diſpeſcere.
Epaſco, epaſcis, epavi, epaſcere, epaſtum.

* That the compounds of *Pario* are all declined after the fourth conjugation, though it ſelf be of the third, can be no wonder to him, that remembers, that *Pario* it ſelf was once of that conjugation. Whence *Nova parire*, in *Ennius*, as we ſhewed before in, *Fit Rhi ut pario peperi.*

Qu. **Are there not ſome other words, beſides thoſe here named in this Rule, that being compounded do change their firſt vowel into** e ?

An. Beſides the words here named in this Rule, there be ſome other words, which in ſome, if not all of their compounds do change their firſt Vowel, or Diphthong into *e*. Such are (1) *Facio*, whence *dejecto, ejecto, injecto*, and *rejecto*. (2) *Farcio*, whence *differcio* and *refertio*, but *effarcio* and *infarcio* keep *a*: though there is read *effercio* and *infercio* alſo. (3) *Capto*, from whence *accepto* and *recepto*; and ſo *cupto*, from whence *incepto* and *occepto*. (4) *Halo*, from whence *anhelo*, though *exhalo* keep *a*. (5.) *Mando* from whence *commendo* and *emendo*, though *amando, præmando*, and *demando* keep *a*. (6) *Cano* from whence con-

concento, and *occento*. (7) *Juro*, whence *dejero* and *pejero* though the other compounds of this verb *abjuro*, *adjuro*, *objuro*, and *conjuro*, do keep the first vowel of the simple verb; and even *dejuro*, and *perjuro* is sometimes read too. (8) The old verb *cando*, whence *accendo*, *incendo* and *succendo* (9) *Audio* from whence *obdio*.

¶ *Dejecto* is in *Stat. Virgil* hath *Ora ejectantem. Æn.* 5. *Statius* 9 *Theb. Aust erat furto dextram injectare. Lucret.* l. 2. *Montes ictu rejectant voces ad sidera mundi.* From *cæpto Plaut. Curc.* 1. 1. hath, *Inceptas facinus facere*, and *Menæch.* 5. 5. *Jam herele occeptat insanire primulùm.* From *differcio Hor.* l. 1. *Ep.* 6. hath *differtum transire forum. Cic. pro Sest.* hath *Cloacas refercivi. Plaut. Mostell.* 1. 1. hath *Este, effercite vos. Cic.* 2 *de N. Deor. Poetæ hominum vitam Superstitione omni referserunt. Colum.* l. 12. c. 53. *Largum salem infarcito. Sueton. Mori inedia destinanti per vim ore diducto infarciri cibum jussit.* Where *Budæus* reads *infercire. Cic. in Orator. Neque infarciens verba.* Where in an old copy it is read *inferciens. Concento* is cited by *Gouldman* from *Plaut.* And *occento* is found in him in divers places. *Curcul.* 1. 2. *Quid si adeam ad fores atq; occentem.* So *Merc.* 2. 3. *Perf.* 4. 4. *Ter. Eun.* 2. 3. hath *Liquet mihi dejerare. Cic. pro Rosc. Com. Qui mentiri solet, perjerare consuevit. Id. pro Rab. Posth. ubi semel quis pejeraverit, ei credi postea non oportet. Plaut. Rud.* 5. 2. *Dejura te mihi argentum daturum. Hor.* l. 2. *Sat.* 3. *Quare, si quidvis satis est, perjuras, surripis, aufers!*

To this Rule may also be referred for likeness of change of *a* into *e*, these verbs in *or*: *Patior* from whence *perpetior*; yet *compatior* (if any such word be) keeps *a*. So *gradior*, whence *aggredior*, *congredior*, *digredior*, *egredior*, *circumgredior*, *prægredior*; *progredior*, *regredior*, and *suggredior*: Yet *retrogradior* keeps *a. Plin.* l. 2. c. 15. *Ab his retrogradiuntur ad solem. Id.* l. 8. c. 15. *Ob id retrograditur in pascendo.*

CHAP. VII.

CHAP. VII.

Qu. WE have spoke of the Rule for the verbs that *change* their first vowel into *i*: **which is the Rule for those verbs, that change their first vowel into** i, **and that both in the** present, **and** preterperfect **tense?**

An. The Rule for those verbs, that change their first Vowel or Diphthong into *i* in the *Present* and *Preterperfect* tense is this

Mutantia primam vocalem in I.

Hæc habeo, lateo, *Hæc habeo, lateo, salio, statuo, cado, lado, [Pango dans pegi] cano, quæro, cado, cecidi, Tango, egeo, teneo, taceo, sapio, rapióque, Si componantur vocalem primam in* i *mutant ut rapio rapui, eripio, eripui.*

Qu. What is the meaning of this Rule?

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That these verbs *habeo, lateo,* &c. being compounded do thorowout both in their present and preterperfect tense, *change* their first Vowel or Diphthong into *i*: as of *rapio rapui* compounded with *e* is made *eripio eripui.*

¶ *Habeo*] As *exhibeo, inhibeo,* &c. But yet *posthabeo* (as is noted in the Margine) *simplicis formam servat.*

Lateo] As *deliteo,* for which Mr. *Burles* hath *dilito* unless it be a mis-print.

Salio] As *exsilio, insilio, desilio, dissilio, assilio, resilio, consilio, subsilio, transilio, supersilio,* which have the Supines, *prosilio,* and *absilio,* which want them.

Statuo] As *instituo, destituo, astituo, præstituo, restituo, prostituo, constituo, substituo.*

Cado] As *accido, concido, decido, excido, incido, intercido, occido, procido, succido, supercido.* Of which *incido, occido, recido,* have *Supines,* or at least *Participles*

ples in *rus*, which cannot be formed but from Supines; the reſt want them.

Lædo] As *allido*, *collido*, *illido*; but *oblædo*, keeps *æ* unchanged. *Plaut. Caſin.* 2. 5. *Ne oblæſis* [for *oblæſeris*] *manum.*

Pango dans pegi] This word doth not properly belong to this Rule, becauſe there is no change of vowel in the preterperfect into *i*: but the preterperfect tenſe keeps its firſt ſyllable unchanged, remaining the ſame in compoſition, that it was before it was compounded; but it belongs to the next Rule, *Hæc ſi componas.* The Teacher may blot it out, and ſupply the room of it thus: *Et placeo, maneo*—— for thoſe two words, though not named in the Rule, yet have relation to it, in as much as in ſome of their compounds, they do *change* their firſt vowel into *i* thorowout. And to theſe if we will hearken to *Alvarus*, we ſhall add *amico*, *amicor*, whoſe compounds are *inimico*, *inimicor.*

Cano] As *accino*, *concino*, *incino*, *occino*, *percino*, *præcino*, *recino*, *ſuccino.* Yet *Tacitus* l. 2. hath *Tum ſentius occunere cornua tubaſque juſſit. Daneſ.* l. 2. c. 12.

Quæro] As *acquiro*, *conquiro*, *exquiro*, *inquiro*, *perquiro*, *requiro.*

Cædo cecidi] As *aſcido*, *excido*, *incido*, *intercido*, *occido*, *percido*, *præcido*, *recido*, *ſuccido.*

Tango] As *attingo*, *contingo*, *pertingo*, which have *tactum* in their Supines.

Ægeo] As *indigeo*, without Supines.

Teneo] As *abſtineo*, *attineo*, *pertineo*, without Supines as *Farnaby* and *Burles* ſay: yet *Rhenius* allows of *abſtentum*, as from which is formed *abſtentus.* Whence the *J. C.* ſay, *Abſtentus hæreditate*, i. e. *ſeparatus*, held off, or kept from: but *contineo*, *detineo*, *retineo* with Supines.

Taceo] As *conticeo*, *obticco*, *reticeo*, *ſubticeo*, all without Supines.

L. Sapio]

Sapio] As *desipio, resipio,* Whence *Plin.* l. 14. c. 1. *Vitis picem resipiens.*

Rapioque] As *abripio, arripio, corripio diripio, eripio, præripio, proripio, surripio. Plaut. Cure,* 1. 1. *ut quæque occasio est, illi surripere se ad me.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of that Note touching the compounds of** cano **annexed to the Rule** —A cano natum Præteritum per ui, ceu concino, concinui dat?

A cano natum.

An. The meaning of the Note annexed to the Rule touching the compounds of *Cano* is this: That the compounds of *Cano* make their preterperfect not in *cini* like the simple vero, but in *cinui*; as of *concino* is formed *concinui*, and so in the rest.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule, and the Note annexed thereto declined?**

An. The words in this Rule and Note are declined thus:

The declining of the words.

Habeo, habes, habui, habere, habitum.
Lateo, lates, latui, latere, [*latitum.*]
Salio, Salis, salii, & salui, salire, saltum,
Statuo, statuis, statui, statuere, statutum.
Cado, cadis, cecidi, cadere, casum.
Lædo, lædis, lasi, lædere, lesum.
Pango, pangis, panxi [*& pegi*] *pangere, pactum.*
Cano, canis, cecini, canere, cantum.
Quæro, quæris, quæsivi, quærere, quæsitum.
Cædo, cædis, cecidi, cædere, cæsum,
Tango, tangis, tetegi, tangere, tactum.
Egeo, eges, egui, egere.
Teneo, tenes, tenui, tenere, tentum.
Taceo, taces, tacui, tacere, tacitum.
Sapio, sapis, sapui, [*& sapivi*] *sapere,* [*sapitum*]
Rapio, rapis, rapui, rapere, raptum.
Eripio, eripis, eripui, eripere, ereptum.
Concino, concinis, concinui, concinere [*concentum.*]

Qu. **What is the meaning of that Rule touching** placeo **and the compounds of it?** viz.

A placeo, ſic diſpliceo; ſed ſimplicis uſum
Hæc duo complaceo, cum perplaceo bene ſervant.

A placeo, ſic diſpli-ceo.

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That though *placeo* compounded with *dis* do change its firſt vowel into *i*, ſo that of *placeo* ſo compounded is made *diſpliceo*, yet compounded with *con* or *per* (and we may add *bene*) it keeps its firſt vowel unchanged, as in *complaceo*, *perplaceo*, and *beneplaceo*.

¶ *Complaceo*] This verb is not lightly found, but in the preterperfect tenſe, and in the paſſive form: but in that it is more frequent. So *Plaut. Rud.* 1. 2. *Hoc deo complacitum eſt. Ter. And.* 4. 1. *Poſtquam me amare dixi, complacita eſt tibi.*

Qu. How are the words of this Rule declined?

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus:

The declining of the words.

Placeo, places, placui, placere, placitum.
Diſpliceo, diſplices, diſplicui, diſplicere,
Complaceo, complaces, complacui, complacere, complacitum.
Perplaceo, perplaces, perplacui, perplacere, perplacitum.
So *beneplaceo, beneplaces, &c.*

Qu. What is the meaning of that Rule touching pango, and the compounds of it? Viz.

Compoſita a pango retinent a quatuor iſta
Depango, oppango, circumpango atque repango?

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: that theſe four compounds of *pango*, viz. *depango*, *oppango*, *circumpango*, and *repango* (whereunto may be added a fifth; viz. *expango*) do keep their firſt vowel unchanged into *i*, though it be ſo changed in others, as *compingo*, and *impingo*.

¶ *Oppango*] *Rhenius* reads it *oppingo*; but *oppango* I take to be the right reading, and ſo *Stephanus* ſets it down. The preterperfect of this verb is read in *Plaut. Cure.* 1. 1. *ubi ſuaſum oppegit, fugit.*

Expango] This verb is read in *Plin.* l. 2. c. 26. *Idemque auſus rem etiam deo improbam, annumerare poſteris ſtellas, aciſdera ad normam expangere.*

Qu.

Qu. **How are the words of this rule declined?**

The declining of the words.

An. The words of this rule are declined thus:
Pango, pangis, panxi, [*& pegi*] *pangere, pactum.*
Depango, depangis, depegi, depangere, depactum, *
Oppango, oppangis, oppegi, oppangere, oppactum, *
Circumpango, -gis, -pegi, --pangere, --pactum, *
Repango, repangis, repegi, repangere, repactum, *
Expango, expangis, expegi, expangere, expactum.

* *Farnaby* saith these four want Supines, but other Grammarians, and Lexicographers allow them Supines as *Ramus, Rhenius, Stephanus, Gouldman,* &c. Examples I believe are scant, yet some there are. See afterward in the fourth Question after *Hæc raro,* &c.

Qu. **What is the meaning of that Rule touching** *maneo* **and his compounds**, Viz.

A maneo manſi, minui dant quatuor iſta
Præmineo, emineo, cum promineo, imminetque,
Simplicis at verbi ſervabunt cætera formam.

An. The meaning of the Rule is this, That these four compounds of *maneo*, viz. *præmineo, emineo, promineo* and *imminco*, not only change their *a* into *i* in the preſent tenſe, but alſo have *minui* in their preterperfect tenſe, whereas the reſt of the compounds of that verb neither change their firſt vowel into *i*, in the preſent tenſe, and have *manſi* (like the ſimple verb) in the preterperfect tenſe; as *permaneo permanſi*; ſo *remaneo, commaneo, obmaneo, emaneo* (to ſtay out of place) and *intermaneo.*

Præmineo] *Voſſius* likes of *præminui*, though he ſaith he had not read it.

Emineo] To this may be added the decompound *ſupereminco* (which, as all the reſt that have *minui*, want the Supines) uſed by *Virgil*, 6. *An. Victorque viros ſupereminet omnes.*

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

The declining of the words.

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus:
Maneo, manes, manſi, manere, manſum.
Præmineo, præmines, præminui, præminere.

Emineo

Emineo, emines, eminui, eminere.
Promineo, promines, prominui, prominere.
Immineo, immines, imminui, imminere.

Qu. We have ſpoken of thoſe verbs, that change their firſt vowel into *i*, as well in the preterperfect as preſent tenſe: **which is the Rule for thoſe Verbs that being compounded, do change their firſt vowel into** u?

An. The Rule for thoſe verbs that change their firſt vowel into *u* is this:

compoſita a ſcalpo, calco, ſalto, a per u mutant: *Compoſita a ſcalpo.*
Id tibi demonſtrant exſculpo, inculco, reſulto.

Qu. **what is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That theſe Verbs *ſcalpo, calco,* and *ſalto* being compounded, do change their firſt vowel into *u*: ſo that *ſcalpo* compounded with *ex* becomes *exſculpo*; *calco* compounded with *in* becomes *inculco*, and *ſalto* compounded with *re* becomes *reſulto*.

¶ *Scalpo*] In this our Authour follows *Diomedes*; and Mr. *Harris* follows our *Authour*. *Diomedes* ſaith no ſuch word as the ſimple verb *ſculpo* is found, and therefore we muſt ſay, *Scalpere gemmam*, and not *ſculpere*. *Id ſt verum eſt, innumeri libri* (ſaith *Duiburgenſis*) *mendoſi erunt, in quibus legimus ſculptor & ſculptile.* p. 127. But he might have read in *Ovid. Met.* l. 10. *Fab.* 8. *Interea niveum mirâ feliciter arte ſculpſit ebur. Plin.* l. 36. c. 4. *Marmore ſculpendo inclaruerunt.* And that of *Cic.* 4. *Acad. Non enim eſt e ſaxo ſcalptus*, was read *ſculptus*, as *Stephanus* tells us, *in veteri codice.* Now if there be ſuch a verb as *ſculpo* (and if there be not, then beſides that theſe *Authours* are miſread, many *Grammarians* alſo are miſtaken, as *Ramus, Voſſius, Rhenius, Farnaby Burles*, &c.) I ſay, if there be ſuch a verb as *ſculpo*, then it was needleſs to fancy a change of *a* in *ſcalpo* into *u* to make thereof in compoſition *ſculpo*, which already was in being, without any ſuch change. Beſides *excalpo* (as they have been pleaſed to write) in the proper

per sense of the word (to *scratch*, *scrape*, or *pick* out) is read without any change of *a* into *u*: *Appul. Met.* 9. *Ipse delato lumine scabiem vetustam cariosæ testæ accipit excalpere.* So *Cato* de r. r. *Foramina longa pedes tres semis & excalpta digitos sex.* If the teacher pleas he may thus read the Rule.

Si componantur calco, salto, a per u mutant,
Id tibi demonstrant composta inculco, resulto.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

The declining of the words.

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus:

Scalpo, scalpis, scalpsi, scalpere, scalptum,
Calco, calcas, calcavi, calcare, calcatum.
Salto, saltas, saltavi, saltare, saltatum.
Exsculpo, exsculpis, exsculpsi, exsculpere, exsculptum.
Inculco, inculcas, inculcavi, inculcare, inculcatum.
Resulto, resultas, resultavi, resultare resultatum.

Qu. We have spoke of the verbs that *change* their fifth vowel into *a*: **Which is the Rule for those that lose a vowel out of their first syllable?**

An. The Rule for those that *lose* a vowel out of their first syllable is this:

Composita a claudo, quatio, lavo, rejiciunt a:
Id docet a claudo, occludo, excludo, a quatiòque,
Percutio, excutio: a lavo, proluo, diluo nata.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That these three verbs *claudo*, *quatio*, and *lavo*, being compounded, do lose *a* out of their first syllable, so that *claudo* becomes *cludo*; as in *occludo*, and *excludo*, *quatio* becomes *cutio*, as in *percutio*, and *excutio*; and *lavo* becomes *luo*, as in *proluo* and *diluo*.

¶ *Claudo*] That there is such a word as *cludo* of like sense with *claudo* is evident by testimonies out of Classical Authours. *Cic.* 2. *de N. Deor. Ipsum autem mare sic terram appetens litoribus cludit. Sen.* Ep. 25. *Intra quæ quisquis desiderium suum clusit. Sen.* c. 3. *de Tranq. Animi, Nos non in unius urbis mœnibus clusimus.*

Senec.

Sen. Med. Quaſcunque aperui tibi vias, cluſi mihi. Gell. l. 12. c. 19. *Tot verba in pauciſſimas literas cludere. Plin.* l. 33. c. 1. *Alii ſub gemmis venena cludunt. Varro. de* r. l. l. 3. c. 3. *Quæ maceriæ ad villam venationis cauſâ cluduntur.* So *Val. Flac. Martial. Juvenal. Statiuſ. Columel.* This being ſo, what need of taking the remoter verb *claudo* for the compounding of *occludo*, and *excludo* withal, or any other the like compounded words (which are many, *concludo, includo, accludo, percludo, præcludo, circumcludo, intercludo, recludo, ſecludo*) when the nearer verb *cludo* is at hand to be uſed, without any change, loſe, or trouble? Whereupon (ſaith *Sebaſtian, Duisburgenſis*) *Compoſita magis a cludo videntur quàm a claudo.* But if Mr. *Farnaby*, or *Burles*, *Bird* or *Hayne*, or any other will rather compound theſe words of *claudo* than of *cludo*, (that is go by the Bow rather than by the String) they may for me; Since it is indifferent with *Alvarus* to form them from either. p. 227.

Quatio] It ſeems to me to be an invererate errrour, to write *u* after *q*, which is no *letter* but an *abbreviation* of two letters *c* and *u* into one character, partly compoſed, and perfectly ſtanding for both: and if nothing elſe, the very forming of *excutio* from *quatio* by the caſting away of *a* doth evince it: for *quatio* being turned into *cutio* by the caſting away of *a*, it muſt follow either that *q* ſtands for nothing but *c*; and then what are we troubled with a needleſs ſuperfluous Letter for? or elſe that it ſtands for *c* and *u*: and then if *u* muſt be written after *q*, then when that character is reſolved into *c* and *u*, there muſt be an *u* twice written after *c*, and we muſt write, not *excutio* but *excuutio*, which is againſt all example, and Orthography. And therefore ſome, that would write accurately, do not write *quis, quæ, quid*, but *qis, qæ, qid.* But if this errour be too overgrown, to be amended, (as there is no hope, being eſpouſed by ſo great *Grammarians*, and ſo ingrown into *uſe* with every body as it is) we muſt then touching this verb,

ſay with Mr. *Burles*, that the compounds of *quatio* do change *qua* into *cu*: as *concutio, decutio, diſcutio, excutio, incutio, percutio, recutio, ſuccutio.*

Lavo] If this verb had been written and read *lauo* with an *au* diphthong, there had been no more to do: but being written, and read *lavo*, it may be enquired how either *proluo* or *diluo*, or any other the like word ſaid to be compounded of it, can with *pro* or *di* &c. and that which remains of this verb, when *a* is caſt out of it, make *proluo* or *diluo*, or any ſuch other word. For what will remain of *lavo*, when *a* is caſt out, but *lvo*? and what doth that either ſignifie, or ſound? or what doth it make compounded with *pro* or *di*, but *prolvo* or *dilvo*? but thoſe are not the words, which are here ſaid to be made of *lavo*, by caſting away *a*, but *proluo*, and *diluo*. There muſt therefore be a further change in the word made to fit it for compoſition. The conſonant *v* muſt be changed into *u* vowel, and be divided from the *o*, and joyned to the *l*, ſo as to make *luo*. But to what purpoſe is all this ſtirre, caſting out, and changing of letters and ſyllables, when there is at hand the verb *luo* ready, without any thing at all of this, for this compoſition? For ſuch a verb as *luo* undoubtedly there is, and that both in *Dictionaries* and *Authours*. Thence *Cic. ad Att.* l. 12. *Quomodo ergo hæc lucra? Id.* 3. *Ver. Ejus libidinem hominum innocentium ſanguine lui velles, ? Id. Ver.* 9. *Maculas furtorum & flagitiorum tuorum ſociorum innocentium ſanguine lucre arbitrabare?* i. e. *abſtergere & eluere*, ſaith *Stephanus*. And hence *Voſſius* compounds theſe words. For having declined *luo, lui, luitum, unde luiturus*, he adds. *Hinc diluo, dilui, dilutum. Sic abluo, eluo, veluo. Etymolog.* p. 124. *Daneſius* could like this, but that the ſignification of the word is againſt it. Why but amongſt other ſignifications, this alſo is given to it by *Gouldman*, to *wipe* or *waſh* away, and that ſuitable to thoſe derivations which are given it, either from *lavo* in Latine, or from λούω in Greek. And from what can thoſe Metaphorical expreſſions of *Cicero*, where he hath

libidi-

bibi nem ſanguine lui, and *maculas luere*, be fetched from, but ſuch ſignification of the word? Therefore it ſeems more commodious to derive theſe compound words *proluo*, *diluo*, &c. from *luo*, than from *lavo*. Yet if this ſatisfie not, rather than give offence to any of our Grammarians, who are otherwiſe minded (and they I ſee are many, *Hayne*, *Harris*, *Bird*, *Farnaby*, *Shirley*, &c.) I ſhall be contented, that it may be as they ſay: and ſo we will compound not only *proluo*, and *diluo*, but *abluo* and *eluo*, and *perluo*, and *interluo*, and all of *lavo*. For *perluo*, 'tis read in *Colum.* l. 12. c. 53. *Oportebit aquâ dulci diligenter perlui.* And *interluo* is in *Claudian de Rapt. Proſerp.* l. 1. *--Rupit confinia Nereus Victor, & abſciſſos interluit æquore montes.*

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus: The declining of the words.

Claudo, claudis, clauſi, claudere, clauſum.
Quatio, quatis, [quaſſi] quatere [quaſſum.]
Lavo, lavis, lavi, [lavere,] lotum, & lautum.
Occludo, occludis, occluſi, occludere, occluſum.
Excludo, excludis, excluſi, excludere, excluſum.
Percutio, percutis, percuſſi, percutere, percuſſum.
Excutio, excutis, excuſſi, excutere, excuſſum.
Proluo, proluis, prolui, proluere, prolutum.
Diluo, diluis, dilui, diluere, dilutum.

Qu. **May not ſome word be yet further added of the like nature with theſe mentioned in the Rules, untaken notice of in any of them?**

An. There may perhaps be added one word, which changeth the diphthong in its firſt ſyllable into *o*, in three compounds of it, and that is *Plaudo*, three of whoſe compounds, *viz. diſplodo*, *explodo*, and *ſupplodo*, are made of it by the change of *au* into *o*, which yet remains unchanged in the other compounds of it, *viz. applaudo*, and *complaudo*.

¶ From *ſupplodo Cic.* 1. *de Orat.* hath, *Nemo in illo judicio ſupploſit.* Theſe verbs Mr. *Danes* derives from the old verb *plodo ploſi*, of which yet he ſaith, *neſcio an*

unquam in uſu. Perhaps thoſe, in whom *au* is read, come of *plaudo*, and thoſe in which *o* is read come of *plodo*, if ever there were any ſuch verb, as Mr. *Danes* doth fanſie to have been, wherein I will determine nothing.

To the laſt Rule *Compoſita a claudo*, &c. Our ingenious Poetical Grammarian Mr. *Shirley* adds *cauſo*, giving the Rule thus: *Hæc claudo, cauſo, quatio, lavo, rejiciunt a.* p. 91. But I cannot find ſuch a word as *cauſo* in *Stephanus* or *Gouldman*, though *cauſor* be ordinary. And *Stephanus* compounds *accuſo* of *ad*, and not *cauſo*, but *cuſo*, an antiquated frequentative of *cudo*: adding that there are ſome, who compound it from *ad* and *cauſa*, or *cauſor*, and that more rightly in *Gouldmans* opinion. But why may there not antiently as well have been *cauſo*, as *cuſo*, though now out of uſe? There have been *adulo*, and *comito*, and *conſolo*, *crimino* and *digno*, *fruſtro* and *horto*, *auguro* and *amplexo*, as well as their deponents in *or*, which now are in uſe: and why might there not have been *cauſo*, as well as *cauſor*? But it is not my part to be Umpire betwixt perſons of ſo great wit and learning: neither needs that ingenious perſon ſo poor a defence, as my *weakneſs* is able to make for him. Let the Reader chuſe for, and pleaſe himſelf.

And thus far of the Verbs whoſe compounds differ from their ſimples both in the preſent and preterperfect tenſe.

CHAP. VIII.

Qu. **Which is the Rule for thoſe verbs that being compounded differ from their ſimples in the** preſent, **but not in the** preterperfect **tenſe?**

An. The Rule for thoſe verbs that, being compound-

ed

ed do *differ* from their ſimples in the *Preſent*, but *not* in the *Preterperfect* tenſe is this.

Mutantia primam vocalem in I præterquam in præterito.

Hæc ſi componas.

Hæc ſi componas, ago, emo, ſedeo, rego, frango.
Et capio, jacio, lacio, ſpecio, premo, ſemper,
Vocalem primam præſentis in I ſibi mutant
Præteriti nunquam; ceu frango, refringo, refregi,
A capio, incipio, incepi.

Qu. **what is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That ſome verbs and particularly theſe here named in the Rule, *ago, emo,* &c. being compounded, do *change* the firſt vowel of their *Preſent* tenſe into *i*, but do *not change* the firſt vowel of their *Preterperfect* tenſe into any other thing from what it was.

As for example, if *frango fregi* be compounded with *re*, then *frango* is made *fringo*, as in *refringo* the *a* of the preſent tenſe being changed into *i*: but *fregi* is not made *frigi*, the *e* in the compound Preterperfect tenſe *refregi* remaining the ſame, that it was in the ſimple preterperfect tenſe *fregi*. Thus by like change *capio* being compounded with *in*, becoms *incipio*, but *cepi* is not turned into *cipi*, but remains the ſame that it was: the preterperfect tenſe of *incipio*, being not *incipi*, but *incepi*.

¶ *Hæc ſi componas*] To theſe may be alſo added *lego, facio,* and *pango pegi*, which all in compoſition do change the firſt vowel of their preſent tenſe into *i*, but not the firſt vowel of their preterperfect tenſe: as *deligo, delegi; conficio, confeci; compingo, compegi*; Yet with exception of ſome particulars diſagreeing with the Rule, as we ſhewed before of *pango*, and ſhall ſhew by and by of *facio*, and *lego*. And to this Rule may be referred theſe verbs in *or*, *fateor*, from whence *confiteor* and *diffiteor*; and *apiſcor* from whence *adipiſcor* and *indipiſcor*.

Ago] As *abigo, adigo, exigo, redigo, ſubigo, tranſigo, tranſadigo, prodigo,* which wanteth the Supines, and *ambigo,* which wanteth both preterperfect tenſe and Supine.

Emo] As *eximo, perimo, redimo,* and *adimo,* if it be compounded of *ad* with *emo*, and not rather *demo,* as *Phocas* and *Diomedes* thought. But *coemo* keeps the vowel of the preſent tenſe. *Hence Cic. Verr. 6. Quæ tam non modò non vendebant, verùm etiam coemebant.*

Sedeo] As *aſſideo, conſideo, deſideo, inſideo, obſideo, perſideo, præſideo, reſideo, ſubſideo.* But yet *circumſedeo,* and *ſuperſedeo,* keep the firſt vowel of their preſent tenſe. *Cic. Phil. 10. Ut intelligat non D. Brutum, quem vallo circumſedet, ſed ſeipſum obſideri. Liv. l. 1. b. Pun. Saguntum veſtri circumſedent exercitus.* Though *circumſideo* alſo is ſaid, and read, as *Stephanus* ſaith, quoting diverſe places from *Cic. & Liv.* unleſs they be miſwritten. For in the firſt mentioned by him, *Cæl. ad Cic.* l. 8. Ep. 15. In ſtead of (as he reads it) *Niſi maluit Pompeium Brunduſii circumſidere,* in the corrector copies it is *circumſedere.* But in *Cic. Attic,* l. 9. Ep. 14. it is as he reads it, *P. Rom. exercitus Cn. Pompeium circumſidet,* viz. in the Edition of *Dupuys* yet with a Note in the Margine that *Lambine* reads it *circumſedet. Superſedeo* is every where. *Cic. 2. de Invent. Omnino narratione ſuperſedendum. Cæſ. b. G. l. 1. Propter eximiam opinionem virtutis prælio ſuperſedere ſtatuit.* So *Plaut. Cato, Liv. Plin. Gell.*

Rego] As *corrigo, porrigo, erigo, arrigo, dirigo,* and *ſubrigo,* whence *Plin.* l. 9. c. 29. *Ita ſe paulatim ſubrigeas.*

Frango] As *adfringo, confringo, defringo, diffringo, effringo, infringo, perfringo, præfringo, refringo*

Capio] As *accipio, concipio, decipio excipio, incipio, occipio, percipio, præcipio, recipio, ſuſcipio.* But yet *antecapio* keeps *a.* Thence *Sall.* in *Catil. Sed ea omnia luxu antecapere. Ib. Conſul optimum factu ratus, noctem quæ inſta-*

instabat antecapere. Id. Jug. Maxime festinans tempus legatorum antecapere, quos ante prælium factum ab Adherbale Romam missos audiverat. Thence in *Liv.* l. 5. *ab urbe. Non loco castris antecapto, non præmunito vallo.* And in *Cic.* 1. *de N. Deor. Antecapta animo rei quædam informatio.* I presume *anticipo* is the more usual word.

Facio] As *abjicio, adjicio, circumjicio, conjicio, dejicio, dissicio, ejicio, injicio, interjicio, objicio, præjicio, projicio, subjicio, superjicio, trajicio, transjicio.* But there is read *superjacio* also. Thence in *Colum.* l. 2. c. 21. *Et arboribus delapsa folia superjacièbantur.*

Lacio] As *allicio, illicio, pellicio, perlicio.* But *alicio* hath *elicui* in the preterpertect tense. Thence *Ovid* in *Ibin. Elicuit pluvias victima cæsus aquas.* And so indeed saith *Priscian* l. 10. the other compounds of this verb *allicio, illicio,* and *pellicio,* made *allicui, illicui,* and *pellicui,* but *allexi, illexi,* and *pellexi,* are the more usual.

Specio] As *aspicio, circumspicio, conspicio, despicio, dispicio, inspicio, perspicio, prospicio, respicio, suspitio.*

Premo] As *apprimo, comprimo, deprimo, exprimo, imprimo, opprimo, perprimo, reprimo, supprimo.*

Qu. **How are the words in this Rule declined?** The declining of the words.

An. The words in this Rule are declined thus:

Ago, agis, egi, agere, actum.
Emo, emis, emi, emere, emtum.
Sedeo, sedes, sedi, sedere, sessum.
Rego, regis, rexi, regere, rectum.
Frango, frangis, fregi, frangere, fractum.
Capio, capis, cepi, capere, captum.
Facio, facis, feci, facere, factum.
[*Lacio, lacis, lexi, lacere, lectum.*]
[*Specio, spicis, spexi, specere, spectum.*]
Refringo, refringis, refregi, refringere, refractum
Incipio, incipis, incepi, incipere, inceptum.

Qu. **What is the meaning of that Note touching some of the compounds of** *ago, viz.* ——— *Sed pauca notentur.*

Sed pauca notentur.

Namque ſuum ſimplex perago ſequitur, ſatagoque
Atque ab ago dego dat degi, cogo coegi.

An. The meaning of that Note or Rule is this; That two of the compounds of *ago* namely *perago*, and *ſatago* to which we may perhaps add a third *circumago*, do keep the vowel of the ſimple verb: and two of them namely *dego* and *cogo* do change the firſt vowel of it, but not into *i*, but the firſt into *e*, and the ſecond into *o*.

¶ *Circumago* is ordinarily read. *Liv.* l. 1. *ab urbe. Prius quàm circumagerent frenis equos, terga vertunt. Plin.* l. 2. c. 3. *Circumagitur orbis* 24. *horarum ſpatio. Hor.* l. 1. *Sat.* 9. *Nil opus eſt te circumagi.*

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

The declining of the words.

An. The words of this Rule, are declined thus:

Perago, peragis, peregi, peragere, peractum.
Satago, ſatagis, ſatigi, ſatagere.
Circumago, --gis, --egi, --agere, --actum.
Dego, degis, degi, degere.
Cogo, cogis, coegi, cogere, coactum.

Q. **What is the meaning of that Rule touching ſome compounds of** rego *? Viz.*

A rego ſic pergo.

A rego ſic pergo perrexi, vult quoq. ſurgo
Surrexi. mediâ præſentis ſyllabâ ademptâ.

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That two compounds of *rego*, namely *pergo*, and *ſurgo* do not change *re* into *ri*, like the other compounds of it, *erigo, corrigo*, &c. but leave it quite out.

Q. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

The declining of the words.

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus:

Rego, regis, rexi, regere, rectum.
Pergo, pergis, perrexi, pergere, perrectum.
Surgo, ſurgis, ſurrexi, ſurgere, ſurrectum.

Qu. **What Rule is there touching the compounds of** facio *?*

An. Touching the compounds of *facio* there is this Rule:

Nil

Nil variat facio, niſi præpoſito præeunte,
Id docet olfacio, cum calfacio, inficioque.

Nil variat facio.

Qu. **what is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That when *facio* is compounded with a prepoſition, the firſt vowel of it is changed into *i*, elſe nor.

Therefore we ſay not *olficio*, but *olfacio*, nor *calficio*, but *calfacio*, becauſe thoſe verbs are not compounded with any prepoſition, but with *oleo*, and *caleo*, two verbs; and again we ſay *inficio*, and not *infacio*, becauſe that verb is compounded with the prepoſition *in*.

¶ *Olfacio cum calfacio*] So *floccifacio*, *naucifacio*, *ſatisfacio*, *benefacio*, *malefacio*, *frigefacio*, *compendifacio*, and *commonefacio*. Againſt the two laſt words Mr. *Burles* in his Margine ſets theſe two words [*ex uſu*] with an *aſteriſc* directing to them, as meaning, I imagine, that thoſe words are out of uſe, but if he mean otherwiſe, then I miſapprehend him. The former of them is in *Plaut. Moſtell.* c. 1. 57. *Orationis operam compendifacere.* So *Id. Perſ.* 3 5. *Nam ego hodie compendifeci binos panes indies.* The latter is ordinary. *Cic. Fam.* 5. 3. *Is vos doceret, & commonefaceret. Cic.* 4 *Verr. Illi eum commonefaciunt, ut ſi ei videatur, utatur inſtituto ſuo.* So *Sall.* and *Gell.* See *Stephanus* and *Nizolius*. But perhaps that *Aſteriſc* was intended only as a direction to the former of them, and that indeed is not ſo uſual.

Inficioque] So *afficio*, *conficio*, *deficio*, *efficio*, *interficio*, *officio*, *perficio*, *præficio*, *proficio*, *reficio*, *ſufficio*.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus:

The declining of the words.

Facio, facis, feci, facere, factum.
Olfacio, olfacis, olfeci, olfacere, olfactum.
Calfacio, calfacis, calfeci, calfacere, calfactum.
Inficio, inficis, infeci, inficere, infectum.

Qu. **What Rule is there for the compounds of** Lego?

An.

An. for the compounds of *lego* there is this Rule:

A lego nata re, *A lego nata re, se, per, præ, sub trans præeunte*
Præsentis servant vocalem in i cætera mutant.

Qu. What is the meaning of this Rule?

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That some compounds of *lego* do not change the first vowel into *i*, namely those that are compounded with *re, per, præ, sub* and *trans* (whereunto *ad* may also be added) as *relego, perlego, prælego, sublego, translego,* and *allego*: but that the rest of the compounds of *lego* do change the first vowel of it into *i*: as *deligo, eligo, diligo, intelligo, negligo, seligo.*

¶ *Se*] The adding of *Se* amongst the particles, with which when *lego* is compounded, it *changes* not the first vowel into *i*, seems to be a mistake, and it seems also to be noted by some hand setting an *Asterisc.* before it. For *seligo* is the usual writing, not *selego*. So *Cic. in Orat. Omnia expendet, & seligat. Ovid. 3. Amor. 3. eleg. Tu seligo tantum.* The Teacher, if he please, may put out *se*, and make up the verse by putting in [*ad*] thus:
A lego nata re, per, præ, sub, trans, ad præeunte.
For *ad* compounded with *lego* makes *allego*, not *alligo*. Thence *Suet. in Tiber. Instanti sæpius, ut civitate donatum in Decurias allegeret, negavit se allecturum*; Perhaps to distinguish it from *alligo* the compound of *ligo*, and so in the rest, where likeness of composition may expose to mistake.

Qu. **What is the meaning of that Note annexed to this Rule touching the compounds of** lego?

De quibus hæc intelligo. *Viz.*
De quibus hæc intelligo, diligo, negligo tantum,
Præteritum lexi faciunt; reliqua omnia legi.

An. The meaning of that note is this: That of the compounds of *lego*, three make their Preterperfect tense in *lexi*, viz. *intelligo diligo*, and *negligo*: but all the rest in their Preterperfect tense have *legi.*

De quibus hæc intelligo--negligo] Anciently these words made *intellegi*, and *negligi*. So *Diomedes* and *Pris-*

Priſcian tells us, that *Æmil. Macer* ſpake *Omnem noſtrum neglegerit autoritatem.* And M. *Antonie* in *Cic. Phil.* 13. *Theopompum nudum, expulſum a Trebonio, confugere Alexandriam neglegiſtis.* And that *Ulpian* did uſe *intellegerit* for *intellexerit* more than once, is atteſted by *Voſſius de Analog.* l. 3. c. 27. But theſe are now out of uſe.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus: The declining of the words.

Lego, legis, legi. legere, lectum.
Intelligo, intelligis, intellexi, intelligere, intellectum.
Diligo, diligis, dilexi, diligere, dilectum.
Negligo, negligis, neglexi, negligere, neglectum.

And thus far of the Rules for the preterperfect tenſes of verbs as well compound as ſimple.

CHAP IX.

Qu. WE have ſpoken of the Rules for the forming of *Preterperfect tenſes*, and are now to proceed to the Rules for the forming of *Supines*; **Is there any Order obſerved by the Grammar in the treating of theſe things?**

An. In treating of the Rules for the forming of *Supines* the Grammar obſerves this *Order*: *Firſt* it treats of the Supines of *Simple* verbs; And *then* of the Supines of verbs *Compounded.*

Qu. What General **Rule have you for the forming of the Supines of ſimple verbs?**

An. For the forming of the Supines of ſimple verbs we have this Rule.

De Simplicium Verborum Supinis.

Nunc ex Præterito diſcas formare Supinum: *Nunc ex Præterito.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That the Su-

Supines of *ſimple* verbs, are formed from their *Preterperfect tenſes* according to the directions given in the particular rules hereafter following; wherein from the termination of the *Preterperfect tenſe* we are taught how to form the *Supine*, and that according to the order of the Alphabet, beginning with *bi*, and going on to *ci*, *di*, *gi*, *li*, *mi*, *ni*, *pi*, *qui*, *ri*, *ſi*, *pſi*, *ti*, *vi*, *ui*, *xi*.

Qu. **what is the Rule for the forming of the** Supine, **from thoſe preterperfect tenſes, that end in** bi?

An. The Rule for the forming of the *Supine* from a preterperfect tenſe ending in *bi*, is this: *Bi ſibi tum format; ſic namque bibi bibitum fit.*

Bi ſibi tum format.

Qu. **what is the meaning of that Rule?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That of a Preterperfect tenſe ending in *bi*, the Supine is formed by changing *bi* into *bitum*: as of *bibi* by ſuch change is made *bibitum*.

¶ *Bi ſibi tum format*] I ſhould rather ſay by changing *i* into *itum* or *bi* into *bitum*, than by adding *tum* unto *bi*: becauſe the *i* in *bi* in the preterperf. is long; but the *i* in *itum* or *bitum* in the Supine is ſhort: and therefore there is more in the forming of this Supine, than a bare addition of *tum*, there is alſo a mutation of *i* long into *i* ſhort.

Qu. **How is the word in this Rule declined?**

An. The word in this Rule are declined thus:

The declining of the word.

Bibo, bibis, bibi, bibere, bibitum.

Qu. **what is the Rule for the formation of the Supine from a preterperfect tenſe in** ci?

An. The Rule for the forming of the Supine from a preterperfect in *ci* is this ———

Ci ſit ctum.

Ci ſit ctum; ut vici victum teſtatur, & ici Dictum.

Qu. **what is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That of a preterperfect ending in *ci*, the Supine is formed by changing

changing *ci* into *ctum*: as of *vici* by ſuch change is made *victum*; and of *ici ictum*.

Qu. **Is there any Exception from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule there is no exception: yet upon it we are to make this *obſervation*, That thoſe verbs appertaining to it, which did change *a* in their preſent tenſe into *e* in their preterperfect tenſe; do in their Supine change the *e* again into *a*: ſo as that of *feci* formed from *facio*, is not made *fectum* in the Supine, but *factum*: nor of *jeci* from *jacio*, *jectum*, but *jactum*; and ſo our Authour, *Feci factum*, *jeci quoque jactum*

¶ This obſervation is not peculiar to this Rule, but extends it ſelf further, even unto all thoſe verbs of what Rule ſoever, that have changed either *a*, or *æ* in their preſent tenſe into *e* or *i* in their preterperfect tenſe, which all in their Supine do reſume or take again their changed letter: as theſe which changed *a* into *e*; *pango pegi*, *frango fregi*, *ago egi*, *fallo fefelli*, *capio cepi*, *pario peperi*, *do das dedi*, *ſto ſtas ſteti* have *pactum*, *fractum*, *actum*, *falſum*, *captum*, *partum*, *datum*, *ſtatum*. So theſe which changed *a* or *æ* into *i*, *cædo cecidi*, *cædo cecidi*, *pago pepigi*, *tango tetigi*, *cano cecini* have *caſum*, *cæſum*, *pactum*, *tactum*, & *cantum*.

Et ici dansictum] Of the preſent tenſe of this verb we have an example in *Plaut. Truc.* 2. 7. *Hoc vide, dentibus frendit, icit femur.* Of the preterperfect in his *Vidular. Ibi ut piſcabar, Fuſcinâ ici vidulum.*

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus: The declining of the words.

Vinco, vincis, vici, vincere, victum.
Ico, icis, ici, icere, ictum,
Facio, facis, feci, facere, factum,
Jacio, jacis, jeci, jaccre, jactum.

Qu. **What is the Rule for the forming of Supines from preterperfect tenſes in di?**

An. The Rule for the forming of Supines from pre-

preterperfect tenſes ending in *di*, is this:

Di fit ſum. *Di fit ſum, vidi viſum.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That of a preterperfect ending in *di* the Supine is formed by changing *di* into *ſum*, as of *vidi* by ſuch change is made *viſum*.

Qu. **Are there any words excepted from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule there are *excepted* four Supines which end in *tum*, though formed from preterperfect tenſes in *di*, viz. *tentum* from *tetendi*, *peditum* from *pepedi*; *datum* from *dedi*; and (which here is not named) *eſtum* from *edi*.

Qu. **What is the meaning of that firſt Note annexed to this Rule**, viz. —— *Quædam geminant ſi ut pandi paſſum, ſedi ſeſſum: adde ſcidi quod*
Dat ſciſſum, atque fidi fiſſum, fodi quoque foſſum.

An. The meaning of that Note is this: That ſome Supines formed from preterperfect tenſes in *di*, beſides the change of *di* into *ſum* in the end, do alſo aſſume or take in *s* before *ſum* in the middle, as in *ſedi ſeſſum*, *ſcidi ſciſſum*, *fidi fiſſum*, *fodi foſſum*.

◀ *Geminant s*] This taking of letters into the middle, beſides the change of the laſt ſyllable, is not peculiar to this Rule, but extends to verbs of other Rules alſo. Thus *miſſum* and *paſtum* from *miſi* and *pavi* take in *s*; *tanſum* and *punctum* from *tutudi* and *pupugi* take in *n*; *hauſtum* from *hauſi* takes in *t*; *ſolutum* and *volutum* from *ſolvi* and *volvi* take in *u*.

Ut pandi paſſum] This verb did anciently form a regular Supine *Panſum*, from the preterperfect tenſe *pandi*. And though *Alvarus* and *Deſpauterius*, *Ramus* and *Rhenius*, and diverſe of our Engliſh Writers, as *Hayne*, *Shirley*, *Harris*, name no other Supine for this verb, but *paſſum*: Yet *Voſſius* and *Farnaby*, *Burles* and *Jaſp. Berengi* do give it *panſum*, as well as *paſſum*. Thence *Prudent.* in *Cathemer. Hymn. ult.* *Panſis in al-*

tum

tum brachiis. & l. 1. *cont. Symmach. Vix panſo poterat currere carbaſo.* And thence ſaith *Voſſ.* (*Etymol. Lat.* p. 113. in *Pliny* is *expanſa retia. Gell.* l. 15. c. 15. hath *Capillo quoque mulier paſſo dicitur quaſi porrecto & expanſo*, even in that very place, where he denies the uſe of *panſum* and *expanſum*: but whence can *expanſus* come, but from *expanſum*? and whence that, but from *panſum*? So *Lucret.* l. 1. *Deniq; fluctifrago ſuſpenſa in litore veſtes ureſcunt, eædem diſpanſa in ſole ſereſcunt.* So *Plantin* in his Edition plants it; and ſo *Voſſius* ſaith the place was written in his own, and other Manuſcripts. Whence *Daneſ.* gives *diſpanſum* for the Supine of *Diſpandi*, which were anciently *diſpendi diſpeſſum*, as he ſaith, *Schol.* l. 2. c. 13. *Tertull. adv. Gent.* c. 48. *Diſpoſitioni æternitatis aulæi vice oppanſa eſt. Minut. Felix in Octavio. Signum planè naturaliter viſimus in navi, cum velis tumentibus vehitur, cum expanſis palmulis labitur.* But now it ſeems *Euphoniæ gratiâ* there is a change of the *n* into *s*, ſo that of *panſum* is made *paſſum* and *expaſſum*. Thence *Cic. paſſis velis pervehi.* And *Virg. Æn.* 1. *Ecce trahebatur paſſis Priameïa virgo Crinibus.* And *Tacit.* l. 21. *Expaſſæ repente delubri fores.* The uſers of *panſum* are noted by *Rhenius* to be *recentiores.* p. 190.

This changing of letters in the middle (that by the way upon this occaſion we may ſpeak of it) happens alſo in other verbs. Thus in *freſſum* of *frendi n* is changed, as here into *s*; in *lotum* from *lavi a* is changed into *o*; in *lautum* from *lavi*, and *cautum* from *cavi a* is changed into *au*; in *ſatum* from *ſevi e* is changed into *a*; in *vulſum* from *velli* (if *vulſum* muſt according to our *Author* be formed from *velli*, and not rather from *vulſi*) and in *ſepultum* from *ſepelivi e* is changed into *u*; and in *cultum* from *colui o* is changed into *u*.

Adde ſcidi quod dat ſciſſum] Of *ſcidi* ſaith *Voſſius*, is the Supine (as I ſuppoſe that ſhould be, which is miſprinted *præteritum*) *ſciſum*, for which they vulgarly uſe *ſciſſum*: for which he ſuppoſes the reaſon to be, be-

cauſe

cauſe that in *ſciſſum* the firſt vowel is long, whereas *ſcidi* it is ſhort. But from *ſciſum* he cites out of Liv. l. 3. *Detruncata corpora brachiis abſciſis.* and *Faſtis*, l. 5. *Abſciſis manibus.* But uſe hath prevailed to have it written with a double *ſſ*.

Qu. **What is the meaning of that ſecond Note annexed to the Rule, touching the Supines of verbs, which double the firſt ſyllable of the preſent in the preterperfect tenſe**, viz.

Hic etiam advertas. *Hic etiam advertas, quod ſyllaba prima ſupinis*
Quam vult præteritum geminari non geminatur:
Idque totondi dans tonſum docet, atque cecidi
Quod cæſum, & ccidi quod dat caſum, atque tetendi
Quod tenſum & tentum, tutudi tunſum, atque pepedi
Quod format peditum; adde dedi quod jure datum vult.

An. The meaning of this ſecond Note is this: That ſuch verbs as have a reduplication of their firſt ſyllable of the preſent tenſe in their preterperfect tenſe, have not that reduplication in their Supines. So that of *totondi* is made not, *totonſum*, but *tonſum*; of *cecidi*, not *cecæſum* but *cæſum*; of *tetendi* not *tetenſum* or *tetentum*, but *tenſum & tentum*; of *tutudi* not *tutunſum*, but *tunſum*; of *pepedi*, not *pepeditum*, but *peditum*.

¶ *Hic etiam advertas*] This note is not peculiar neither to the verbs in this Rule, but is extended unto other verbs alſo,: as namely unto *pepigi pactum*, *pupugi punctum*; *pepuli pulſum*; *cecuit* (if any ſuch preterperfect tenſe may be allowed of) *culſum*; *feſelli fulſum*; and *cecini cantum*.

Atque tetendi quod tenſum & tentum] From *tenſum* comes *tenſus* Stat. 9. *Theb. Poplite tenſo ſaxa tener. Lucan.* l. 1. *Et varias ignis tenſo dedit aere formas. Id.* l. 1. *Tenſiſque rudentibus actæ.* From *tentum* comes *tentus Hor.* 2. *Serm. Seu pingui tentus omaſo Furius. Id. Epiſt.* 16 *Referſque tenta Grex amicus ubera. Id. Sp.* 17. *Neque eſt levare tanta ſpiritu præcordia.* lb. *Od.* 12. *Tenta cubilia tectaque rumpit.*

Tutudi tunſum] Thence *Virgil. Georg.* 3. *Tunſa*

gali

galla admiſcere ſaporem. Id. Georg. 4. Tunſis gemet area frugibus. An. 1. Tunſæ pectora palmis. This verb hath another Supine, namely *tuſum.* Thence *tuſus. Plin.* l. 22. c. 13. *Radix tuſa cum aceto non minus utilis. Ib.* c. 21. *Folia tuſa in paſtillo digerunt. Ib.* c. 25. *Panis tuſus atque iterum coctus. Daneſ. Voſſius Farnaby.*

Atque pepedi quod format peditum] *Deſpauterius, Voſſius, Farnaby* and *Burles, Ramus* and *Rhenius,* &c. give this verb a Supine: Other Grammarians think otherwiſe. Mr. *Harris* gives it none. *Richerius* denies it hath any. *Alvarus* and *Duisburgenſis* ſpeak warily of it. This laſt ſaith, *Supinum eſt peditum, licet non ſit multum frequens.* The former, *Hujus verbi ſupinum non facilè invenies: qui putant habere peditum, non ſatis probant.* Whereupon ſome are ſo wiſe as to ſay nothing of it, as *Hayne* and *Bird.* That *Voſſius* allows of it, he gives you his ground, which is his reading the verbal *peditus* or *peditum* in *Catull. Carm.* 5. 5. *Subtile & leve peditum Libonis*; and his finding it in *Charisius* l. 2. If you like not his reaſon, which is the beſt, and all I ſee given, you may put it out, as ſome do, and in the ſtead of it write, ——*atque pependi Quod format penſum.* Which Supine is generally allowed of, as from *pendo*, though not as from *pendeo*, which *Voſſius* and *Farnaby* deprive of Supine, though *Harris* and *Richerius* are pleaſed to give it one, with whom do ſide not *Ramus* only, but *Rhenius*, who ſaith, thence is formed *penſilis*, uſed by *Plaut.* in *Pſeud.* 1. 1. *Reſtim volo mihi emere, qui me faciam penſilem.*

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule and its Notes declined?**

An. The words in this Rule and Notes are declined thus:

The Declining of the words.

Video, vides, vidi, videre, viſum.
Pando, pandis, pandi, pandere, paſſum [*& panſum.*]
Sedeo, ſedes, ſedi, ſedere, ſeſſum.
Scindo, ſcindis, ſcidi, ſcindere, ſciſſum.
Findo, findis, fidi, findere, fiſſum.

Fodio, fodis, fodi, fodere, fossum.
Tondeo, tondes, totondi, tondere, tonsum.
Cædo, cædis, cecidi, cædere, cæsum.
Cado, cadis, cecidi, cadere, casum.
Tendo, tendis, tetendi, tendere, tensum [& tentum.]
Tundo, tundis, tutudi, tundere, tunsum [& tusum.]
Pedo, pedis, pepedi, pedere, peditum.
Do, das, dedi, dare, datum.

Qu. What is the Rule for the Supines of preterperfect tenses ending in Gi?

An. The Rule for the forming of Supines from preterperfect tenses ending in *gi*, is this: *Gi fit ctum, ut legi lectum.*

Gi fit ctum.

Qu. What is the meaning of that Rule?

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That of a preterperfect tense ending in *gi*, the Supine is formed by changing *gi* into *ctum*: as of *legi* by such change is made *lectum*.

Qu. What Exceptions are there from this Rule?

An. There is but one word properly excepted from it, which is *fugi*, from which the Supine is formed, not by changing *gi* into *ctum*, but into *gitum*.

In all the other words *gi* is changed into *ctum*: only there is in them some further alteration in their former and middle syllables; the reduplications omitted, as in *pepigi, tetigi*, and *pupugi*; and the first vowel of the present resumed, as in *pegi* of *pango*, *pepigi* of *pago*, *fregi* of *frango*, *tetigi* of *tango*, and *egi* of *ago*; and the *n* in the present tense of *pungo*, that was left out in *pupugi* the preterperfect tense, reassumed into the Supine *punctum* (if it must be said to be formed of *pupugi*, and not rather of *punxi*, which though hardly found alone, yet is the common preterperfect tense to the compounds of *pungo*.) So our Authour goes on——

——*tegi pepigique*
Dat pactum, fregi fractum, tetigi quoque tactum,
Egi actum, pupugi punctum; fugi fugitum dat.

Q

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus: The declining of the words.

Lego, legis, legi, legere, lectum.
Pango, pangis, pegi, & panxi, pangere, pactum.
[Pago, pagis,] pepigi, [pagere,] pactum.
Frango, frangis, fregi, frangere, fractum.
Tango, tangis, tetegi, tangere, tactum.
Ago, agis, egi, agere, actum.
Pungo, pungis, pupugi, pungere, punctum.
Fugio, fugis, fugi, fugere, fugitum.

Qu. **What is the Rule for the forming of Supines from Preterperfect tenses in** li?

An. The Rule for the forming of Supines from preterperfect tenses ending in *li* is this ——

Li fit sum; ut falli stans pro fale condio falsum. *Li fit sum.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That of a preterperfect tense ending in *li*, the Supine is formed by changing *li* into *sum*: as of *falli* by such change is made *falsum*.

Qu. **Is there any Exception from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule there are properly but three words excepted. The first is *tuli*, whose Supine *latum* is either a word borrowed from elsewhere to supply the place of a Supine to it, or else formed of it, by changing *li* into *latum*, and casting away the first syllable *tu*. The second is *pepuli*; and the third *ceculi*, which form not *li* but *i* into *sum*, and do moreover cast away the initial reduplicated syllables *pe* and *ce*, so making *pulsum* and *culsum*.

Qu. **But are the other two words in the Rule regularly formed?**

An. The other two words in the Rule are regularly formed as touching the last syllable: for they both change *li* into *sum*, according to the Rule. But the first, namely *falsum*, resumes the first vowel of its present tense, and rejects the reduplication in the preterperfect

tense: So of *fefelli* making *falsum*. And the second namely *vulsum* (if *vulsum* must be formed of *velli*, and not of *vulsi*) besides the change of *li* into *sum* in the end changes also *e* into *u* in the beginning, So of *velli* making *vulsum*. So our Authour, *Dat pepuli pulsum, fe-culi culsum, atque fefelli Falsum; dat velli vulsum; tuli habet quoque latum.*

¶ *Salli stans pro sale condio*] This Note *stans pro sale condio* is put here to distinguish *salli* of *sallo* from *salli* of *psallo* (as some write it, though the right writing be *Psalli*) the former hath *falsum* for his Supine, the latter hath no Supine. Anciently there hath been *salitum* or *sallitum*; whence *salitus* or *sallitus*. *Corn. Sever. Ad quem salliti pomiliones adferebantur.* But that was of *salivi* of the fourth conjugation, in all likelihood.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus:

The declining of the words.

Sallo, sallis, salli, sallere, salsum,
Pello, pellis, pepuli, pellere, pulsum.
[*Cello, cellis, ceculi, cellere, culsum.*]
Percello, percellis, perculi, percellere, perculsum.
Fallo, fallis, fefelli, fallere, falsum.
Vello, vellis, velli [*& vulsi,*] *vellere, vulsum.*
Fero, fers, tuli, ferre, latum.

Qu. **What Rule is there for the forming of Supines from preterperfect tenses in** mi, ni, pi, and qui?

An. For the forming of Supines from preterperfect tenses ending in *mi, ni, pi,* and *qui*, there is this Rule.

Mi, ni, pi, qui tum fiunt.

Mi, ni, pi, qui tum fiunt, velut hic manifestum.
Emi emtum, veni ventum, cecini a cano cantum,
A capio cepi dans captum, a cœpio cœptum;
A rumpo rupi ruptum, liqui quoque lictum.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That of a preterperfect tense ending in *mi, ni,* or *pi*, a Supine is formed by changing *i* into *tum*; and of a preterperfect ending

ending in *qui* a Supine is formed by changing *qui* into *ctum.*

As of *emi* by ſuch change is made *emtum*; of *veni ventum*; of *cecini* (*a* of the preſent tenſe being withal reſumed, and *ce* the reduplication in the preterperfect tenſe being rejected) is made *cantum*; of *cepi* from *capio* (the firſt vowel of the preſent tenſe being reſumed) is made *captum*; of *cœpi* from *cœpio* is made *cœptum*; of *rupi ruptum*; and of *liqui lictum.*

¶ *Emi emptum*] So it is written ordinarily; but the right writing is *emtum*, and moſt agreeing with this Rule, which ſaith *mi tum fit*, not *mi ptum.* Though it rather methinks ſhould have been, *Mi, ni, pi faciunt tum, qui ctum hic ut manifeſtum*; or in ſome ſuch way. For ſtrictly, if *mi, &c.* be made *tum*, then *emi* will neither be *emtum*, nor *emptum*, but *etum*, ſo *veni*, not *ventum*, but *vetum, &c.*

A cœpio cœptum] This verb is looked upon as a Defective: (and ſo delivered to be afterward in our Grammar, like *odi* and *memini*) in the preſent tenſe, at leaſt *magnâ ex parte.* And I ſuppoſe that, and the tenſes coming of it, are not very vulgarly read. Yet read they are, ſome of them at leaſt, both in *Plaut.* and *Ter.* and *Cato.* From this laſt *Voſſius* quotes, *Cœpiam ſeditioſa verba loqui.* And ſo from *Cæcilius in Peribœa. Aere obſcuro hercle deſinam, Mane cœpiam. Plaut. Truc.* 2. 1. *ubi nihil habeat alium quæſtum cœpiat. Id. Mænech.* 5. 5. *Neque ego inſanio, neque ego pugnas, neque lites cœpio. Id. Perſa.* 1. 3. *Lubido extemplo cœpere eſt convivium. Ter. Ad.* 3. 3 (or as ſome read 4.) *Annon ſex totis menſibus Prius olfeciſſim, quàm ille quidquam cœperet.* So *Voſſius* reads it, though others *cœperit*; and ſo *Turnebus*, adding, *omnino legendum eſt cœperet, ab antiquo verbo cœpio; nam temporum ratio illud cœperit refutat, & aſpernatur; cœperet autem flagitat & poſcit.* And ſo *Donatus.* But whether all this will ſerve either to render this verb no defective, or to bring it back again into uſe I know not. See *Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 39. *Alvar.* p. 243.

Liqui quoque lictum] The ſimple Supine *lictum*, or any thing of it, is hardly read but in *Priſcian*, and from him in *Stephanus*, but without any example of it, or derivative participle, or verbal from it. Thence our *Authour* afterwards reckons it among them that want Supines. *Reſpuo, linquo, luo, &c.* And ſo both Mr. *Harris* leaves it without Supine; and *Richerius*; declining it *linquo liqui, rejecto ſupino.* Yet in the compounds of it *delinquo* and *relinquo lictum* is read. And ſo *Alvarus* ſaith, *Linquo caret ſupino, compoſita habent; ut relictum, delictum*; and ſo *Richerius, compoſita lictum fabricant in ſupino, ut delinquo deliqui, delictum, &c.* And thence it is that that thoſe, give this word a Supine, as our *Authour* here, *Deſpanterius, Ramus, Rhenius, Voſſius, Shirley* and *Bird*, are to be underſtood (as I conceive) as meaning only, that it hath a Supine when it is compounded. And accordingly *Alvarus* gives the Rule for this verb thus: *Linquo ſibi liqui, cupiunt ſibi pignora lictum.* And ſo *Hayne, a liqui formato relictum*; adding in his Margine this Note, with a reference to the Supine *relictum. In compoſito relinquo: Supina verbi ſimplicis non leguntur.* And Mr. *Farnaby* and *Burles* to ſhew the ſame have only the compound *relinquo, reliqui, relictum*, and not the ſimple *linquo, liqui lictum.* And with this diſtinction of having a Supine, when it is compounded, and of having no Supine, when it is not compounded, is that contradiction of himſelf wherewith our Authour by ſome is charged, eaſily ſalved and cleared.

Q. **How are the words of this rule declined?**

The declining of the words.

An. The words of this rule are declined thus:

Emo, emis, emi, emere, emtum.
Venio, venis, veni, venire, ventum.
Cano, canis, cecini, canere, cantum.
Capio, capis, cepi, capere, captum.
[*Cœpio, cœpis*] *cœpi*, [*cœpere*] *cœptum.*
Rumpo, rumpis, rupi, rumpere, ruptum.
Linquo, linquis, liqui, linquere, lictum.

Q.

Qu. **What is the Rule for the Supine of a Preterperfect tense ending in** Ri?

An. The Rule for the forming of a Supine from a preterperfect tense in *Ri* is this—— *Ri fit ſum*

Ri fit ſum, ut verri verſum.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That of a Preterperfect tense ending in *ri*, a Supine is formed by changing *ri* into *ſum*; as of *verri* by ſuch change is made *verſum*.

Qu. **Is there any exception from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule *partum* is excepted, which beſides that it caſts away the reduplication of the preterperfect tense, and reſumes the firſt vowel of the preſent tense, changes alſo *ri* into *tum*, ſo that from *peperi* of *pario* is formed *partum*.

¶ *Verri verſum*] It may be ſuppoſed that antiently it hath formed *verritum*: becauſe thence formed may be read *converritor*. Whence *Appul.* in *Apologia*, hath *converritorem pridianæ reliquiæ*: but all too old to be brought back into uſe.

Partum] I conceive *partum* may be ſaid to be made by a *Syncope* from *paritum*, and that formed from *parui*: both becauſe ſome of the compounds of *pario* have *pevui* in the preterperfect tense, as *operio* and *aperio*; and becauſe the participle in *rus*, formed from this verb is *pariturus*. See before, *fit rio ri*: and *Cujus nata peri*. But But I will not contend with any about it. Only I ſhall tell him that *Deſpauterius* from *peperi* of *pario* forms both *partum* and *paritum*: *Dat pario peperi partum paritum*. So he whom *Duisburgenſis* follows therein ſaying, *Dat peperi partum vel paritum; hinc pariturus, illinc partus*.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?** The declining of the words.

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus:

Verro, verris, verri, verrere, verſum.
Pario, paris, peperi, parere, partum.

Qu. **What is the Rule for the Supine of Preterperfect tenses ending in** *si*?

Si fit sum. *An.* The Rule for forming a Supine from a preterperfect tense ending in *si* is this: *Si fit sum ut vidi vi sum.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this, That of preterperfect ending in *si* a Supine is formed by changing *si* into *sum*: as of *visi* by such change is made *visum*.

Qu. **Are there any Exceptions from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule only these eight Supines are properly excepted, which end in *tum*, though formed from preterperfect tenses in *si*, namely *fultum, hauſtum, ſartum, fartum, uſtum, geſtum, tortum* and *indultum*: for as for *miſſum*, that doth agree with the Rule, only (as hath before been obſerved of others) it takes in *s* into the middle of it, or doubles the *s* in it; So our Author ——

——— *Tamen s geminato*
Miſi formabit miſſum: fulſi excipe fultum
Hauſi hauſtum, ſarſi ſartum, farſi quoque fartum,
uſſi uſtum, geſſi geſtum: torſi duo tortum
Et torſum, indulſi indultum indulſumq. requirit.

¶ *Viſi viſum*] Unleſs we like rather to form *viſum* alwaies from *vidi*, this may go for *Voſſius*, or any elſe.

Fulſi excipe fultum] This *fulſi* is not of *fulgeo* of the ſecond conjugation, which perhaps borrows a preterperfect tenſe from *fulgo* of the third (read in *Lucret.* l. 5. *Fulgĕre cum cœli donavit plaga vapores.* And ib. l. 6. *Fulgit item cum rarefcunt quoque nubila cœli*) for that verb hath no Supines: but from *fulcio* of the fourth.

Hauſi hauſtum] *Hauſtum* is made of *hauſum* by putting in *t* after the *s*. Thence *hauſurus* in *Virg. Æn.* 4. *Supplicia hauſurum ſcopulis.* In *Appul.* there is found *hauri-*

hauritum: but that is formed from *haurivi*, as much alſo out of uſe, as *hauritum* is. *Voſſius*, *Farnaby*, *Daneſius*.

Farſi fartum] *Fartum* is by a *Syncope* put for *farctum*, as that by a *Syncope* is put for *farcitum*, whence *farcimen* and *farcitus*; which *Cic. in Verr.* hath, *Pulvinus perlucidus Melitenſi roſâ farcitus*. but is now hardly uſed.

Torſi duo tortum & torſum] With our *Authour* herein agrees the *Gryphiſw. Gram.* and *Rhenius* who from *torſi* ſaith *torſio* is formed, which Subſtantive is read in *Plin.* l. 20. c. 17. *Ejus uſus contra torſiones ſtomachi*. But in none elſe can I find *torſum*, unleſs with a note intimating its antiquation: *Voſſius* having mentioned *tortum* adds: *Veteres tamen & torſum dixere, unde Cato* 2. *Orig. Marſus hoſtem occidit prius, quàm Pelignus: Propterea Marucini vocantur de marſo detortum nomen.* So *Alvarus*, *Torſum a torqueo apud vetiſſimos reperitur, ſed jam exolevit. Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 24. *Alvar.* p. 240.

¶ *Indulſi indultum indulſumque*–] *Indultum* is by all allowed of; *indulſum* by none beſide our *Authour* that I meet with except *Sebaſtian Duiburgenſis*, who ſaith of *indulgeo*, that it ſometime hath *indulſum*. It might have been wiſhed he had named ſome *Authority* for it. But that is no eaſie matter to do, at leaſt in the opinion of *Alvarus*, who ſaith, *Indulſum non facile invenies, neq. Grammatici ullum teſtem citant.* p. 240. And till we have authority for the uſe of it, we may do well to let the uſing of it alone.

Qu. How are the words of this Rule declined? The declining of the words.

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus:

Viſo, viſis, viſi, viſere, viſum.
Mitto, mittis, miſi, mittere, miſſum.
Fulcio, fulcis fulſi, fulcire, fultum.
Haurio, hauris, hauſi, haurire, hauſtum,
Sarcio, ſarcis, ſarſi, ſarcire, ſartum.
uro, uris, uſſi, urere, uſtum.

Gero,

Gero, geris, gessi, gerere gestum.
Torqueo, torques, torsi, torquere, tortum.
Indulgeo, indulges, indulsi, indulgere, indultum.

Qu. What is the Rule for the forming of a Supine from a preterperfect ending in psi?

Psi fit ptum.

An. The Rule for the forming of a Supine from a preterperfect ending in *psi* is this: *Psi fit ptum*, as *scripsi scriptum.*

Qu. What is the meaning of this Rule?

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That of a preterperfect ending in *psi* the Supine is formed by changing *psi* into *ptum*; as of *Scripsi* by such change is made *scriptum.*

Qu. Are there any Exceptions from this Rule?

An. From this Rule *campsum* is excepted, which forms *psi* into *psum*, if any such word be read, and may be admitted as *cambio.*

¶ *Psi fit ptum*] So of *sorpsi* is made *sorptum*: and as for *sorbitum*, which seems to have been in use, because thence is formed *sorbitio* used in *Plaut. Pseud.* 2. 3. *Quia sorbitione faciam ego te hodie mea*—that is formed from *sorbitum* of *sorbui.*

Campsi excipe campsum] See *Quarta dat is ivi*, before.

Qu. How are the words of this Rule declined?

The declining of the words.

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus:
Scribo, Scribis, scripsi, scribere, scriptum.
Cambio, cambis, campsi, cambire, campsum.

Qu. What is the Rule for the forming of a Supine from a preterperfect ending in ti?

An. The Rule for the forming of a Supine from a preterperfect ending in *ti* is this——

Ti fit tum;

Ti fit tum; a sto namque steti, a sistoque stiti fit
Præterito commune statum.

Qu. What is the meaning of this Rule?

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That of a pre-

preterperfect ending in *ti*, a Supine is formed by changing *ti* into *tum*: as of *ſteti* by ſuch change (and the reſumtion of *a*) is made *ſtatum*.

Qu. **Is there any exception from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule is excepted *verſum* which is formed of *verti*, by changing *ti* into *ſum*; ſo ſaith our Authour

——*Verti excipe verſum.*

¶ *A ſto namque ſteti, a ſiſtoque ſtiti ſit Præterito commune ſtatum*] That is from *ſteti* the preterperfect of *ſto*, and from *ſtiti* the preterperfect of *ſiſto* (actively ſignifying to *make to ſtand*) is formed one Supine *ſtatum*, whence comes *ſtatus* ſignifying as much as τεταγμένος, as in *ſtati dies*, and *ſtata ſacrificia* as *Voſſius* ſaith, *Etymolog.* p. 122.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus: The declining of the words.

Sto, ſtas, ſteti, ſtare, ſtatum.
Siſto, ſiſtis, ſtiti, ſiſtere, ſtatum.
Verto, vertis, verti, vertere, verſum.

Qu. **What is the Rule for the forming of a Supine from a preterperfect tenſe in** Vi?

An. The Rule for the forming of a Supine from a preterperfect in *vi* is this: *Vi fit tum, ut flavi flatum.* *Vi fit tum.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That of a Preterperfect ending in *vi* the Supine is formed by changing *vi* into *tum*: as of *flavi* by ſuch change is made *flatum*.

Qu. **Are there any Exceptions from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule there are eleven verbs, which have ſupines ſomewhat differing; not in reſpect of their laſt ſyllable, for they all change *vi* into *tum*, and ſo far agree with the Rule, but in reſpect of ſome other letter, or ſyllable, which is added to, taken from, or altered in them.

The

The first is *pavi*, which in the supine takes in *s* before *tum*; so of *pavi* making *pastum*.

The second is *lavi*, which unto *a* takes in *u* before *tum*, and so of *lavi* makes *lautum*, for which they anciently (changing the *a*, or *au* into *o*) said *lotum* (for as for *lavatum* that is regularly formed of *lavavi* now out of use.

The third is *potavi*, which by the taking out of *a* from *potatum* regularly formed makes *potum*.

The fourth is *favi*, of which, by the change of *a* into *au*, is made *fautum*.

The fifth is *Cavi*, of which, by the like change of *a* into *au*, is made *cautum*.

The sixth is *fævi*, of which with the change of *e* into *a* is made *fatum*.

The seventh is *levi*, which with the change of *e* into *i* is made *litum* (for as for *livi* anciently used *litum* is regular, as formed of that; and so of *lini*, not by this, but a former Rule, *Mi, ni, pi- tum fiunt.*)

The eight is *solvi*, of which by the taking in of *u* before *tum*, is made *solutum*.

The ninth is *volvi*, of which by the like taking in of *u* before *tum* is made *volutum*.

The tenth is *singultivi*, of which by the loss of *ti* before *tum* is made *singultum*.

The eleventh is *sepelivi*, of which by the loss of *i* before *tum*, and the change of *e* before *l* into *u* is made *sepultum*.

Qu. **Why do you not except** venum, **which differs more from the Rule than any of them?**

An. I do not except *venum*, because *venum* is no Supine of *veneo*, but a part of its composition, which is made up of *venum* and *eo*; so that *veneo* hath no Supine.

¶ *Flavi flatum*] *Flavi* here is of *flo flas*: not of *flaveo flaves*, for that hath no Supines.

Pavi excipe pastum] *Pavi* here is of *pasco*, not of *paveo*, for that hath no Supines.

Dat lavi lotum interdum lautum atque lavatum] Of *lavo lavas* comes *lavatum*: but of *lavo lavis* in all likelihood comes *lautum* and *lotum*. Some would have *lautum* made of *lavitum* by a *Syncope*: but if *i* be taken out, there muſt ſtill be a change of the *v* conſonant into *u* vowel, and a coalition of thoſe two into one Diphthong *au* to the making of *lautum*. Neither will it ſo agree with our Rule, for when *vi* is taken away from *lavi* to be changed into *tum*, there will remain nothing but *la*: the eaſier way therefore it appears to me, to change *a* into *au*, and then for the reſt all is according to the Rule; and the ſame may be ſaid of *favi* and *cavi*. But ſtill if any think it better to form them of *lavitum*, *favitum*, *cavitum*, I ſhall not gain-ſay.

Potavi potum interdum facit & potatum] *Potatum* is uſed in *Plaut. Pſeud.* 5. 2. *I ſimul mecum potatum.* Thence by a *Syncope* is made *potum*. Which is uſed by *Virgil. Eclog.* 9. *Et potum paſtas age Tityre.* From *potatum* comes *potaturus*, uſed by *Ter. Phorm.* 5. 5. *Nam potaturus apud me eſt.* From *potum* comes *potus* ordinarily read. *Virg. Georg.* 4. *Quoque modo potis gauderent intyba fibris*: and *poturus*, *Lucan.* l. 5. *Strymona ſic gelidum bruma pellente relinquunt Poturæ te Nilegues.*

Cavi cautum] This Supine *Voſſius* forms of *cavitum* by a *Syncope* of *i*, but he muſt alſo change *av* into *au*, elſe it will not do. Hence comes *cavitio* as *Feſtus* ſaith, for that which now we ſay *cautio*. And (as *Scaliger* reads that in *Plaut. Pſeud.* 2.3. which ordinarily is read *cavata*) *cavita eſt. Nam ipſa mihi opportunitas non potuit opportunius Advenire, quam hæc cavita eſt mihi opportune epiſtola. Friſchlin* would have it formed of *catum*, and becauſe *catus* ſignifying *adviſed*, wary, *prudent*, ſeems derived from thence. *Plaut. Epid.* 2. 2. hath *conſilium catum*: and both *Plaut. Pſeud.* 2. 3. & *Cic.* 1 *Tuſc. homo catus.* And *Plaut. Trin.* 3. 2. *Proinde ut corde amantes ſunt cati. Voſſius* rejects this, becauſe *catus*, as he ſaith, never is a Participle. I will not be Umpire

pire betwixt them: Either way from *catum* or *cavitum*, by Addition, or Subtraction, and due alteration, we may form *cautum*: and that's all I care for at present.

Litum] Hence comes *litus* used both in the simple and compound way. In the *simple*. *Virg.* 4. *Georg. Et paribus lita corpora guttis*. *Martial.* l. 10. Ep. 68. *Deque coloratis nunquam lita mater Etruscis*. In the *compound*. *Cic.* 1. *Ep. ad Calv. apud Priscian. Tuli molestè, quod literæ delitæ sunt a te redditæ. Tabulæ se interlitas esse clamant.*

Vult singultivi singultum] Whether *singultum* or *singultitum* be the Supine of this verb, *Vossius* saith, *non satis convenit*. Yet he set down the former (and so do all I meet withal) for the Supine of it: moved thereto by the consideration of *singultus* the verbal. *Rhenius* considering that, and *singulto* also, set it down so too. *Duisburgensis*, when he so set it down, besides his Authour *Despauterius*, who delivers that for the Supine of it, had an eye to the Adverb *singultim*, used by *Horace*, as he cites him, *ut veni coram singultim multa locutus*. Yet *Vossius* considering also that *singultus* may perhaps better come from *singultio*, resolves into this opinion, *ut omnino satius sit Supino abstinere*. *De Etymolog. Lat.* p. 125.

Veneo, venis, venivi, venum] *Veneo* is compounded of *venum* and *eo*, as *venundo* of *Venum* and *do*, and *pessundo* of *pessum* and *do*, and *satisdo* of *satis* and *do*. But verbs are not compounded of, nor formed from their Supines, but Supines formed from their verbs. Therefore being part of the composition of *veneo*, it can be no Supine of it; no more than *pessum* or *satis* can be the Supine of *pessundo* or *satisdo*. And indeed *venum* is a Noun. Hence *Tacit.* 13. *Annal. Militibus immunitas servaretur, nisi in iis quæ veno exercerent.* lb. l. 14. *Posita veno irritamenta luxus*. So that *venire* is in one word *ad venum ire*, or *venum ire*, without, but understanding *ad*, as *Plaut. Mercat. Prolog.* said, *mercatum*

ire,

ire, for *ad mercatum ire*. See *Farnab.* p. 42. *Voſſ. Etymolog.* Lat. p. 130. and *Analog.* l. 3. c. 33. and the *addenda* to that Book. p. 118. And if the authority and reaſon of theſe two great Grammarians muſt ſtand good, then in a miſtake will be not our Authour alone, but many more, as *Deſpauterius*, *Alvarus*, *Ramus*, *Richerius*, *Gram. Gryphiſw. Hayne*, *Harris*, *Bird*, *Jaſz-Berengi*. To ſupply the place of a Supine to this verb, which *Rhenius* ſaw had none of its own, he ſaith, *Supini loco uſurpatur adverbium venum.* p. 222. And Mr. *Shirley* compounds *veneo ex adverbio venum & eo*, *ſicut ex peſſum fit peſſundo*. That *peſſum* properly ſignifieth *deorſum*, *Pareus* ſaith in his *Lexicon Plaut.* and ſo it is an adverb, and ſo he ſaith it is, *valens in imum locum, & quaſi ſub pedes*. But that *venum* is an Adverb is not to me ſo likely, as that it is a noun becauſe of the variations of caſe, which I find of that word, which agree not to an adverb. Yet I will not ſtubbornly contend with any about it: but having reported the opinions of Grammarians in this matter, leave the Reader to chuſe what he is beſt pleaſed withal.

Sepelivi rite ſepultum] *Cato in Thermis* cited by *Priſcian* l. 9. hath, *Mortuus eſt ſepelitus eſt*. Thence it is probable, that *ſepultum* was made by a *Syncope*, of *ſepelitum*, with the change of *e* into *u*. And ſo *Daneſius*, and *Voſſius* affirm. *Voſſ. Analog.* l. 3. c. 33. *Daneſ. Schol.* l. 2. c. 13.

Qu. How are the words of this Rule declined?

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus: The declining of the words.

Flo, flas, flavi, flare, flatum.
Paſco, paſcis, pavi, paſcere, paſtum.
Lavo, lavis, lavi, lavere, lautum, & lotum.
Lavo, lavas, lavi, lavare, lavatum.
Poto, potas, potavi, potare, potatum, & potum.
Favto, faves, favi, favere, fautum.
Cavco, caves, cavi, cavere, cautum.
Sero, ſeris, ſevi, ſerere, ſatum.
Lino, linis, levi, [livi, lini] linere, litum.

Solvo.

Solvo, solvis, solvi, solvere, solutum.
Volvo, volvis, volvi, volvere, volutum.
Singultio, singultis, singultivi, singultire, [singultum.]
Veneo, venis, [venivi] venii, venire.
Sepelio, sepelis, sepelivi, sepelire, sepultum.

Qu. **What Rule is there for the forming of a Supine from a preterperfect in** ui ?

Quod dat ui dat itum. *An.* For the forming of a Supine from a preterperfect in *ui*, there is this Rule: *Quod dat ui, dat itum, ut domui domitum.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule ?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That of a Preterperfect ending in *ui* a Supine is formed by changing *ui* into *itum*: as of *domui* by such change is made *domitum*.

Qu. **Are there any Exceptions from this Rule ?**

An. From this Rule there are three Exceptions:

Qu. **What is the first Exception of ?**

An. The first Exception is of verbs in *uo*, which have *ui* in their preterperfect tense: for in them generally the Supine is formed of the preterperfect tense by changing *ui* into *utum*: as of *exuo exui* is made *exutum*: So our *Authour* ——*Excipe quodvis.*

Excipe quodvis verbum in uo. *Verbum in uo, quia semper ui formabit in utum, Exui ut exutum:*

Qu. **But do not all verbs forming** uo **into** ui **in the preterperfect tense, make** utum **in their Supine ?**

An. Not all verbs in *uo ui* have *utum*, but some *itum*, changing *i* into *itum*, or *ui* into *uitum*: as of *ruo rui* is formed *ruitum*. So our Authour——

A ruo deme rui ruitum dans. —— *A ruo deme rui ruitum dans.*

¶ *Rui ruitum*] With our Authour herein, agree *Despauterius, Duisburgensis, Harris, Shirley, Rhenius, Riberius, Hayne, Alvarus, Burles.* But *Vossius* in his *Analog.* l. 3. c. 32. plainly saith, *A ruo est rui, rutum.* And that such a Supine hath been in use, is evident by

by *ruta cæſa* met withal, not only amongſt the latter Civilians, but in *Varro* de L. L. l. 8. *Ideoque in venditionis lege fundi ruta cæſa ita dicimus ut u producamus.* And again by the compounds of this verb, which have *rutum* in their Supines, acknowledged by thoſe, that allow the ſimple verb to have but *ruitum*; as *diru'um*, *erutum*, whence the Participles *dirutus* and *erutus*. Yet withal that *ruitum* hath been uſed, appears by *ruiturus* derived from it, and uſed by *Lucan.* l. 2. v. 499. *Ite ſimul pedites, ruituram aſcendite pontem.* So by *Ovid. Met.* l. 4. f. 13. *Aut petis, aut urges rituram Siſyphe ſaxum.* And by *diruitus* in an ancient *Inſcription* in *Rome*, wherein is *ædiculam diruitam*, as *Voſſius* cites it from *Gruter.* And by *eruiturus* in uſe, though from *erutum*, as *Voſſius* ſaith. Hence both *Voſſius* himſelf in his *Etymolog. Latin.* p. 124. and *Ramus* and *Farnaby* and the *Gram.* of *Gryphiſw.* give unto this verb *ruitum* and *rutum*. And for ought I know, one may as well be uſed as the other. Hither may be retetred *luo lui*, which (though it be hardly now to be found ἅπαξ expreſſed, and therefore is afterward ranked by our Authour amongſt thoſe, that *raro aut nunquam* have any Supines, yet) hath, or anciently hath had *luitum* for its Supine. Hence *luiturus* in *Claudian. Paneg. 6. Conſul. Hono ii.* --*Puppis Vaſtato tandem pœnas luitura profundo.* And hence *luitio* in *Ulpian* cited by *Stephanus*. Whereupon though *Deſpauterius* and *Alvarus*, *Richerius*, *Hayne* and *Bird*, do deprive this verb of Supine, yet *Voſſius* and *Farnaby*, *Ramus* and *Burles*, *Rhenius* and the *Gryphiſwald Grammar*, *Shirley* and *Jaſp. Berengi* do allow this verb *luitum* for its Supine. Which if it may be allowed, will be another exception to our Authours Exception from *ui* into *utum*, or rather the only Exception that ſo forms *ui*; becauſe *ruo* forms *ui* into *utum*, as well as into *uitum*, if not only *utum*; *uitum* being made of *utum* by the *Epentheſis*, or putting in of *i*. But thus much for the firſt Exception.

Q. What is the second Exception of?

An. The second Exception is of some particular words, which form their Supine by changing *ui* into *tum*: which as our Authour sets them down are these:

Vult secui sectum, necui nectum, fricuiq́,
Vult secui sectum. *Frictum, miscui item mistum, ac amicui dat amictum.*
Torrui habet tostum, docui doctum, tenuique
Tentum, consului consultum, alui altum alitumq́,
Sic salui saltum, colui occulti quoq́ cultum.
Pinsui habet pistum, rapui raptam, seruique
A sero vult sertum, sic texui habet quoque textum.

Of which these thirteen, *secui, necui, fricui, amicui, docui, tenui, consului, alui, salui, occului, rapui, serui,* and *texui,* form a Supine in *tum,* by the just change of *ui* into *tum*; as *secui sectum,* &c. but these four *miscui, torui, colui* and *pinsui,* have some further alteration in them, by loss, or change: *miscui* loseth *c,* and *pinsui n*: *colui* changes *o* into *u,* and *torrui* for two *r r,* takes in one *s.*

¶ *Vult secui sectum*] *Sectum* is formed of *secui,* as things now stand, by changing *ui* into *tum*: but indeed originally it seems to be made by a Syncope of *secatum,* whence *secaturus in Colum.* l. 5. c. 9. mentioned before.

Necui nectum] *Nectum* is likewise by a *Syncope* formed from *necatum*: not that *nectum* the simple supine is any where read, but that *enecto* the compound of *neco,* is supposed to have *enectum,* because thence is formed the participle *enectus* frequently read in *Cicero.* as 1 *Tusc. Mento summo aquam attingens siti enectus Tantalus.* Rufinus also cites *Cic. Philip.* 14. for *internectus*: and though he mention not the words, yet *Stephanus,* from whom I suppose he took them upon trust, doth *Internecti nota credo testamenta subjiciunt.* Though after all this, in that Oration I find no such words. Perhaps they be in some other. He cites also *Plaut. Amphit.* for the same, but without any particular reference,

ference, which he uſeth to be very punctual in. But *Stephanus* again, from whom I ſuppoſe he took it, cites 4. 35. that is act. 1. ſc 1. v. 35. *Duello extincto maximo, atque internecti is hoſtibus.* But there again, in one Edition it is *internecatis*; in another it is *internectis*, yet with *internecatis* in the Margine. And yet *enecatus* is alſo read of *enico*, as was noted before from *Plin.* l. 18. c. 13. *Flaccidorum quoque & in horreis enecatorum, vel major quàm virentium.* Inſtead of *necui necatum*, the Teacher, if he pleaſe, may read, *enecui enectum*: for ſo the verſe will ſtand good too.

Fricui fictum] *Frictum* is alſo by a *Syncope* from *fricatum* of *fricavi*: whence *fricatio, defricatus, perfricatus, infricatus, refricaturus.* Whereof ſee above in *As in Præſenti.*

Miſcui item miſtum] Of *miſcui* regularly is formed *miſcitum*, and of that, ſaith *Voſſius*, by a *Syncope* of *ci* is made *miſtum*. Some leaving out the *i* only, and tranſpoſing the *c* and *s* make thereof *mixtum*: *x* there being no more but *c* and *s*.

Ac amicui dat amictum] So you may ſay; unleſs you ſhall think better to ſay, that *amixi* makes *amictum*, as *Alvarus* doth, giving the Rule for it thus: *—dat amixit amictum*; or unleſs you think fit to form it by a *Syncope* of *i* from *amicitum*, as of *amicivi*.

Tenuique tentum] Hence (*viz.* from *tentum* of *tenco*) *in jure abſtenti dicuntur, qui auctoritate tutoris revocantur ab adeunda hæreditate*, ſaith *Voſſius* citing *Scævola*, *Papinian*, *Ulpian* for the uſe of the word. *De Analog.* l. 3. c. 24. Yet ſaith *Duisburgenſis* the Supine *abſtentum* is not in uſe: according to a memorial verſe; *Abſtineo nullum video retinere ſupinum*; the ſame we may ſay of *attineo*, and *pertineo*, which have no ſupines, according to both Mr. *Farnaby* and *Shirley*.

Conſului conſultum] The regular ſupine is *conſulitum*, but of that, now out of uſe, by a *Syncope* of *i* is made *conſultum*, ſaith *Voſſius*.

Alui altum alitumque] Of *alui* firſt was formed *a-*

litum regularly: and thence by a *Syncope* of *i*, *altum* of *alitum* is *alitus*, read in *Val. Max.* l. 5. c. 4. *Quid tam in usitatum, quid tam inauditum, quàm matrem natæ uberibus alitam?* Of *altum* comes *altus* cited from *Sall.* by *Diomedes*, *Arpini altus*. *Diomedes* yet prefers *alitus*, for the avoiding of ambiguity, leſt *altus ſed*, ſhould be confounded with *altus high*.

Collui cultum] Of *colitum* by a *Syncope* of *i*, and a change of *o* into *u*, is made *cultum*.

Pinſui habet piſtum] Of *pinſui* regularly is formed *pinſitum*. Thence *Colum.* l. 12. c. 27. hath, *Irim bene pinſitam nec plus unciæ pondere addito*. So *pinſitum panicum*, and *pinſitum hordeum* may be read in him. l. 2. c. 9. and l. 8. c. 4. Of *pinſitum* by the *Syncope* or taking out of [*it*] is made *pinſum*. Thence *Vitruv.* l. 7. c. 1. *Id non minus pinſum abſolutum craſſitudine dodrantis*. *Ib. Idque pinſum abſolutum ne minus pedem ſit craſſum*. Of the ſame *pinſitum* again by caſting out *n* and the middle *i* is made *piſtum*. Unleſs ye think rather to form it from *piſo*, which the Ancients, as *Diomedes* ſaith, uſed without *n*. Whence *Plin.* l. 18. c. 10. *Si piſtæ ſerantur*. And thence *piſtor*, and *piſtrinum*, ſaith *Voſſius, de Analog.* l. 3. c. 31.

Serui que ſertum] This ſimple ſupine is not now in uſe; yet it remains in the compounds and derivatives of it. Of which ſee above in *Ro fit vi, ſero ſevi*, &c. But thus much of the ſecond Exception.

Qu. **What is the third Exception of?**

An. The third Exception is of ſome words, which from a preterperfect tenſe in *ui*, form a ſupine in *ſum*, which according to our Author are theſe:

Hæc ſed ui mutant in

Hæc ſed ui mutant in ſum: vim cenſeo cenſum
Collui habet colſum; meto meſſui habet quoque meſſum;
Nexui item nexum, ſic pexui habet quoque pexum,
Dat patui paſſum, caeui caſſum, caritumque.

In which *cenſui*, and *meſſui*, *nexui*, and *pexui* do form a ſupine in *ſum*, not by changing of *ui* into *ſum*, but *ui* into *um* after *s* already in the word, as *cenſui cenſum*,

censum, messui messum, where *s* is formally in: so *nexui nexum*, and *pexui pexum*, where *s* is eminently in: *x* ſtanding for *c s*. But for *cellui*, there is no ſuch ſimple verb as that: only *excello* hath *excellui*, and *præcello præcellui*, and thence by change of the latter *l* into *s* and then of *ui* into *um* is made *excelsum* and *præcelsum*. And for *patui*, it hath no ſupine: *passum* being the ſupine of *pando*, not of *patui*. And *carui* though it form *caritum*, according to the Rule, yet it doth not form *cassum*, according to this Exception.

¶ *Censeo censum*] That *censeo* makes *censum* is ſhewed as *Voſſius* ſaith, by the verbals *census, censor, censura* ordinarily read, and by *censi* and *adcensi* noted by *Feſtus* in the old Authours; and by *recenſo Senatu* ſaid by *Sueton.* in *Veſpaſian*: (And ſo *Suetonius* indeed ſaid, ib. *c.* 9. as *Stephanus*, from whom I ſuppoſe *Voſſius* took it, reads the place, *Supplevitque recenſo Senatu & equite*; though yet *Iſaac Caſaubon* reads it *recenſito Senatu*) and it may be added by the Noun verbal *recenſus*, which *Sueton* in *Jul. Cæſ.* c. 41. hath *Recenſum populi, nec more, nec loco ſolito, ſed vicatim per dominos inſularum egit.* It may alſo be added, that, what this Authour ſaith in the ſame chapter, *Ex his qui recenſiti non eſſent*, the Books of *Pithœus* and *Memmius* read *recenſi*, as *Caſaubon* notes. There is read alſo *recenſitus*, as in the named place of *Sueton.* So in *Claud. Eutrop.* l. 2. *Priſca recenſitis evolvite ſecula penſis.* But that is rather from *recenſio* of the fourth Conjugation, as *Voſſius, Alvarus*, and *Dmeſius* think. To which that makes ſomewhat, that *recenſio* the Noun Verbal is read in the ſame place of *Sueton.* viz. *Jul. Cæſ.* c. 41. *Ac ne qui novi cœtus recenſionis cauſâ moveri quandoque poſſent, inſtituit.* *Voſſius, de Analog.* l. 3. c. 24. *Daneſ. Schol.* l. 2. c. 13.

Cellui habet celſum] What is to be thought of this, ſee above in *cello pro frango cecu'i*

Nexui item nexum] that ſuch a ſupine as *nexum* is, or hath been in being, is evident from *nexus* the parti-

ciple; and *nexus*, and *nexilis* the verbals derived from it. But whether it be from *nexi* or *nexui*, and from *nexo* of the first, or either *necto*, or *nexo* of the third, I leave to others, who have more leisure than I to give, determination upon it: though in the mean time I think we may form it from *necto*.

Sic pexui habet quoque pexum] That such a Supine as *pexum*, hath been formed from *pexui*, appears from *pexus* the participle ordinarily read. Whence *Martial*, l. 2. Ep. 44. *Edit. Farnab. Emi seu puerum togamve pexam.* And from *texitas* in *Plin.* l. 11. c. 24. *Quam non ad hoc pertinere videtur pexitas telæ.* That *pectitum* also hath been formed from this verb, as if it had made in the preterperfect tense *pectui*, or as some say *pectivi* (perhaps not altogether so congruously, being that *pectitum* hath the middle syllable short, which happens not to be in a Supine of a verb that hath a preterperfect in *ivi* of more syllables than two, the compounds of *eo* only excepted). See before in the Rule, *Ab ecto fit exi.*

Dat patui passum] That *passum* is the Supine of *pando*, hath before been shewn. See *Di fit sum. Despauterius*, *Ramus* and *Richerius*, *Shirley* and *Bird*, agree with our Authour in allowing *passum* for the supine of *pateo*, who therein follows *Priscian.* l. 9. and *Diomedes* l. 1. But *Vossius*, *Rhenius*, *Farnaby*, *Burles*, *Hayne*, and the *Gryphisw. Gram.* give it no supine, adding (most of them) that *passum* usually mistaken for the Supine of *pateo*, is the Supine of *pando*. And the other not proving their affirmative; what these say, may for me stand good, especially being so great a Grammarian as *Phocas* concludes it to have no supine, from its forming no participle in *rus*.

Carui cassum caritumque] That of *carui* is *caritum* regularly formed, is out of dispute; as being clear from that of *Ovid. Met* l. 2. *Fab.* 1. *Et tandem nivibus Rhodope caritura*; and that of *Juven.* [6. *Sat.* v. 39. *Cogitat haredem cariturus tuture magno.* But that *cassum* is

formed

formed as any ſupine of it, is not ſo clear. *Deſhauterius*, *Richerius*, *Ramus*, *Duisburgenſis*, *Bird*, *Shirley* and *Jaſz-Berengi* ſide with our *Author*, forming *caſſum*, as well as *caritum* from *carui*. But *Rhentus*, *Farnaby* and *Burles*, form nothing from it but *caritum*. *Voſſius*, *Hayne*, *Alvarus*, are againſt *caſſum*: not only becauſe *caſſus* is a noun adjective, like *laſſus*, but becauſe we cannot ſay *caſſurus*, as we ſay *cariturus*. And though *Priſcian* l. 9. think *caſſum* may be formed of *caveo*, yet l. 10. when he comes to ſpeak of *Participles* and of Tenſes, he is of another mind, for the reaſons afore mentioned. See *Hayne* p. 74. *Voſſ. Etymolog.* p. 108. *Analog.* l. 3. c. 24. *Daneſ. Schol.* l. 2. c. 13. *Alvar.* p. 238.

Q. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus: The declining of the words.

Domo, domas, domui, domare, domitum.
Exuo, exuis, exui, exuere, exutum.
Ruo, ruis, rui, ruere, ruitum & rutum.
Seco, ſecas, ſecui, ſecare, ſectum.
Eneco, enecas, enecui, enecare, enectum.
Frico, fricas, fricui, fricare, frictum.
Miſceo, miſces, miſcui, miſcere, miſtum.
Amicio, amicis, amicui, amicivi, amixi, amicire, amictum.
Torreo, torres, torrui, torrere, toſtum.
Doceo, doces, docui, docere, doctum.
Teneo, tenes, tenui, tenere, tentum.
Conſulo, conſulis, conſului, conſulere, conſultum.
Alo, alis, alui, alere, alitum & altum.
Salio, ſalis, ſalui & ſalii, ſalire, ſaltum.
Colo, colis, colui, colere, cultum.
Occulo, occulis, occului, occulere, occultum.
Pinſo, pinſis, pinſui, pinſere, pinſitum, pinſum & piſtum.
Rapio, rapis, rapui, rapere, raptum.
Sero, ſeris, ſerui, ſerere, ſertum.
Texo, texis, texui, texere, textum.
Cenſeo, cenſes, cenſui, cenſere, cenſum.
Excello, excellis, excellui, excellere, excelſum.
Meto, metis, meſſui, metere, meſſum.

Necto, nectis, nexui, nectere, nexum.
Pecto, pectis, pexui, pectere, pexum.
Pateo, pates, patui, patere.
Careo, cares, carui, carere, caritum.

Qu. **What is the Rule for the forming of a Supine from a preterperfect tense in** xi?

An. The Rule for the forming of a Supine from a preterperfect in *xi* is this, *Xi fit ctum, ut vinxi vinctum.*

Xi fit ctum.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That of a preterperfect tense ending in *xi* a Supine is formed by changing *x* into *ctum*: as of *vinxi*, by such change is made *vinctum.*

Qu. **Is there any thing annexed to this Rule?**

An. To this Rule there is annexed an *Observation*, and an *Exception.*

Qu. **What is the** Observation **annexed to this Rule?**

An. The Observation annexed to this Rule, as our *Authour* makes it, is this —— *Quinque abjiciunt n:*
Nam finxi fictum, minxi mictum, inque supino
Dat pinxi pictum, strinxi, rinxi quoque rictum.

Quinque abjiciunt n.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Observation?**

An. The meaning of this Observation is this: That five preterperfect tenses, *viz. finxi, minxi, pinxi, strinxi, rinxi* do in the forming of the supines from them, besides the change of *xi* into *tum*, also cast away *n*; so that thereof is made *fictum, mictum, pictum, strictum, rictum.*

¶ *Minxi mictum*] *Mingo* of which *minxi* is formed, is an old verb grown out of use, *meio* being used instead thereof: whence *Despauterius* saith - *Cave dicere mingo*: but *minxi* the preterperfect thereof remains in use, supplying the room of that preterperfect, which *meio* should have of its own, but hath not. Whence *Martial.* l. 3. Ep. 78.

Minxisti

Minxiſti currente ſemel Paulline carinâ:
Meicre vis iterum, jam Paliurus eris.

He could as well have ſaid *Mingere vis iterum*, if it had been uſual. *Minctum* hath been uſed formerly, for which *C. Titius* is quoted: but it is now out of uſe. *Richerius* deprives *mingo* of all ſupine. pag. 64. and ſo *Jaſz Berengi.*

Rinxi quoque rictum] That ſuch a verb as *ringo rinxi* hath been in uſe, and the ſupine *rictum* thence formed, is evident by the verbal *rictus* derived from it. Whence *Richerius* reckons it like our *Author*, with thoſe, that have Supines, but caſt away *n* out of the middle of them. p. 64. and ſo *Deſpauterius*. But though vulgar Grammarians take it up, upon the account of *Priſcians* Authority, who in his l. 10. doth own it: yet both *Alvarus* and *Voſſius* tell us, there is nothing of it to be found now in the extant Authours: only the deponent *ringor* being in uſe, which they ſay hath neither ſupine nor preterperfect tenſe. So that when, in the declaring of the meaning of the Obſervation, we ſay *rinxi* maketh *rictum*, the intent is only to ſhew, what it did make, when it was in uſe, not to aſſert it as a verb now to be uſed. See *Alvar.* p. 247. *Voſſ. Etym.* p. 116. *Analog.* l. 3. c. 27. *Daneſ.* l. 2. c. 13.

Qu. **What is the** Exception **from this Rule?**

An. The Exception from this Rule is this:

Xum flexi, plexi, fixi dant, & fluo fluxum. *Xum flexi plexi.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this** Exception?

An. The meaning of this *Exception* is this: That theſe four preterperfect tenſes in *xi*, *flexi*, *plexi*, *fixi* and *fluxi*, do form their Supines, by changing *xi* into *xum*, as making of *flexi flexum*; of *plexi plexum*; of *fixi fixum*, and of *fluxi fluxum.*

¶ *Plexi*] For this verb, as it hath two preterperfect tenſes *plexui*, and *plexi* ſo they make alſo two ſupines, *plexum* and *plectitum*; for the latter of which Mr. *Farnaby* quotes *Columella*, but at large, without mention of place. The *Rudiment writer* hath *plectum*, *plectum* I ſuppoſe

pose it was so mis-printed for *plectum plexum*. For *plectum Stephanus* cites *Priscian* forming *plexi plectum*. But of *plectum* or *plectitum* I see no instances or Authorities, but what ye have heard. Of *plexum Lucretius* hath *plexus* l. 5. *Tum caput atque humeros plexis redimire coronis*. Let that therefore stand.

Fixi] This is generally acknowledged to form *fixum*. But it formeth also *fictum* sometimes say both *Farnaby* and *Vossius*. Mr. *Burles* (if he be not mis-printed) gives it no other but *fictum*. In others *fixum* is the current supine. From *fictum Diomedes* l. 1. cites *Scaurus*, saying, *sagittis confictus*. From *Callistratus* l. 7. *de incendio, ruina, naufragio*, this is cited by *Cujacius*; *Si quando navis vel inficta, vel fractaintra finis agri cujusque fuerit*; where *inficta* is put for *infixa*. *Giffanius* (as *Vossius* saith) proves this from *Cicero*, *Varro*, and others in his *Index*, in the word *fictus*. Yet *fixus*, *fixurus*, *confixus*, *infixus* are so ordinary, that *fictus*, or any compounds of it, as from *figo* will hardly ever come into use again.

Et fluo fluxum] That *fluxi* formeth *fluxum* is out of doubt. And that it hath also formed a regular Supine *fluctum*, is seen by the Verbal *fluctus*. And so *Vossius* and *Danesius* noted But that is now out of use.

Unto these may be added *frixi* of *frigo*, whereof is formed both *frictum* and *frixum*, whence in *Plin.* *frixi*, saith *Vossius*. So in *Cornel. Cels.* l. 2. c. 18. *Tum res eadem magis alit jurulenta, quàm assa, magis assa, quàm frixa.* But *frictus* of this verb is much more usual. See *Columel.* l. 7. c. 5. *Varro* R. R. l. 2. c. 4. *Plaut.* Pœn. 1. 2.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

The declining of the words.

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus:

Vincio, vincis, vinxi, vincire, vinctum.
Fingo, fingis, finxi, fingere, fictum.
[*Mingo, mingis*] *minxi,* [*mingere*] *mictum.*
Pingo, pingis, pinxi, pingere, pictum.
Stringo, stringis, strinxi, stringere, strictum.

[*Ringo,*

[*Ringo, Ringis, rinxi, ringere, rictum.*]
Flecto, flectis, flexi, flectere, flexum.
Plecto, plectis, plexi. plectere, plexum.
Figo, figis, fixi, figere, fixum.
Fluo, fluis, fluxi, fluere, fluxum.

And thus far of the Rules for the forming of the Supines of simple verbs.

CHAP X.

Qu. **What is the Rule for the forming of the Supines of Verbs compounded?**

An. The Rule for the formation of Supines from Verbs compounded is this:

De compositorum Verborum Supinis.

Compositum ut simplex formatur quodque supinum. — *compositum ut simplex.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That the Supine of a compounded verb is so formed, as the Supine of the same verb being simple was formed.

Thus, as of *docui* is made *doctum* by the change of *ui* into *tum*; so of *edocui* is made *edoctum* by the same change; and as of *scripsi* is made *scriptum*, so of *conscripsi* is made *conscriptum.*

Qu. **Is there always an exact conformity of the compound to the simple verb in this respect?**

An. There is sometimes a variation in the supine of the compounded verb, from the supine of the simple verb, as our *Author* noteth in that *Caution* annexed to the Rule, *Quamvis non eadem sint semper syllaba utrique.* — *Quamvis non eadem.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of that Caution?**

An. The meaning of that Caution is this: That there is sometimes a difference in a letter, or syllable betwixt the simple, and compounded supine; as our

Au-

Authour shews in the supines of *tundo, ruo, salio, se-capio, facio, jacio, rapio, cano, pario, largo, carpo, fa-cio, edo,* and *nosco.*

Qu. **What is the difference betwixt the Supi of** tundo, **and the Supines of the Verbs compou ed of it?**

An. The difference betwixt the Supine of *tund* and the Supines of the Verbs compounded of it is this That whereas the simple verb *tundo* hath *tunsum* fo supine, the verbs compounded of it have supines in *sum* without the *n* in the middle, as *contusum* and *pe-tusum.* So our Authour--

Composita a tunsum dempta n tusum.

Composita a tunsum.

¶ *Tunsum dempta n tusum*] Though this may be, yet there is no necessity of it, because as we shewed be-fore, on *Hic etiam advertas,* &c. the simple verb hath *tusum* as well as *tunsum,* for its supine, from whence it formed the simple *tusus,* and so may be the compounds *pertusus* and *contusus.* Neither is this universally true: for *obtunsus* is read with *n* sometimes, though seldomer, if *Stephanus* and *Vossius* take their mark right. For this *Stephanus* cites *Plin.* Ep. 3. l. 7. *Dulcibus cibis acres-cuisque miscerem, ut obtunsus illis & oblitus stomachus his excitaretur.* But in some Books he saith it is *obtusus,* and so it is in mine. *Vossius* quotes *Columellam* l. 6. c. 8. for *obtunso allio;* but in my Book it is *tunso* only. *Eandem partem allio tunso, & halleculâ linive,* are the words of that Authour there. He also quotes *Tertullian* l. 1 *adv. Marcion.* saying that there is read there *obtunsis sensibus.* But yet in that, as appears there even by him, Editions vary. Notwithstanding, what both he and *Stephanus* quote out of *Plaut. in Casin.* 5. 1. *Obtunso ore nunc per-velim progredivi senem,* is there read, and that read-ing owned by *Pareus* in his *Lexicon Plautinum.* So that if at all used, it would be but sparingly.

Qu. **What is the difference between the Supines of** ruo, **and of the verbs compounded thereof?**

An. The difference between the supine of *ruo,* and the

the ſupines of the verbs compounded thereof, as our *Authour* ſets it down, is this: That the ſimple ſupine hath *i* in the middle of it, but the compounds have not *i*. So He

——*A ruitum fit I mediâ demptâ rutum.* *A ruitum fit I mediâ demptâ.*

As in *diruitum, corruitum, eruitum, &c.*

¶ *I mediâ demptâ rutum*] There was no neceſſity of this: there being *rutum* a ſimple ſupine without *i*, as well as *ruitum* with *i*, for the compounds to be formed of, or after, as we ſhewed before in *Quod dat ui.*

A more pertinent Exception might be made of the compounds of *luo*: for whereas the ſimple ſupine is *lutum*, as we have ſhewed, the compounds of it have only *lutum*. Whence that of *Perſius* 3. *Satyr. Dilutas queritur geminet quod fiſtula guttas.* So *Varro* R. R. 3. 9. *Ea abluta condunt in furfures.* So *Columella* l. 6. c. 3. *Licet etiam ſi ſit leguminum inopia & eluta, & ſiccata tinctis-- Id.* l. 9 c. 16. *Expreſſæ favorum reliquiæ, poſteaquam diligenter aqua dulci perlutæ ſunt, in vas aceum conjiciuntur.* If the Teacher pleaſe, he may alter the Rule thus: *--A luitum fit I mediâ demptâ lutum.*

Qu. **What is the difference between the Supine of** ſalio, **and of the Verbs compounded of it?**

An. The difference between the ſupine of *ſalio*, and of the verbs compounded of it is this: That whereas the ſupine of the ſimple verb is *ſultum*, the ſupines of the verbs compounded of it, changing *a* into *u* have *ſultum*, This our Authour notes in his ſaying, *--Et a ſaltum quoque ſultum.* *Et a ſaltum quoque ſultum.*

As in *Exultum* of *exilio*; *diſſultum* of *diſſilio*; *inſultum* of *inſilio*, *aſſultum* of *aſſilio*; *conſultum* of *conſilio*; *reſultum* of *præſilio*; *reſultum* of *reſilio*; *tranſultum* of *tranſilio*: But *poſilio*, and *abſilio* have no Supines.

Qu. **What is the difference between the Supine of** ſero ſevi, **and the compounds thereof?**

An. The difference between the ſimple ſupine of *ſero*

sero sevi, and the compounds thereof is this: Th whereas the simple supine is *satum*, the compoun changing *a* into *i* make *situm*; accordingly as our A thom saith:

A sero, quando satum

A sero, quando satum format, composta situm dant. As in *consitum, insitum, assitum, circumsitum, dep tum, dissitum, intersitum, obsitum, persitum*, supines verbs compounded of *sero sevi*. See *Burles* p. 207.

¶ *Composita situm dant*] Yet *Stephanus* tells us, thr *præsero* read in *Columel.* 7. 9. hath *satum*: but he give no example: The like he said of *resero*, read in *Columel.* 3. 11. that it hath *resatum*, but without example. Mr. *Burles* following him in them adds the like of *subsero*, read in *Columel.* 4 15. but without Example too. Not only *Gouldman* but *Stephanus*, and so *Cooper*, and *Trebellius* his abbreviatours, give it *subsitum* for its supine. Till example appear, to warrant practice, it may be bet both in this, and in the other two, to follow the Rule.

Q. **what is the difference between the Supines of these simple Verbs** capio, facio, jacio, rapio, cano, pario, spargo, carpo, farcio, **and the Supines of the Verbs compounds thereof?**

Ans. The difference between the simple and compound supines of these verbs *capio, facio, jacio, rapio, cano, pario, spargo, carpo*, and *farcio*, is this: That all the compounds (except one from *capio*, and a few from *facio*) do change the *a* of the simple supines into *e*. Hereupon of *captum* is made *ceptum*, of *factum fectum*, of *jactum jectum*, of *raptum reptum*, of *cantum centum*, of *partum pertum*, of *sparsum spersum*, of *carptum cerptum*, and of *fartum fertum*. So our Authour, *Hæc captum, factum, jactum, raptum, a per u mutant, Et cantum, partum, spartum, carptum, quoque fartum.*

Hæc captum, factum.

¶ *Captum*] Hence *acceptum, conceptum, deceptum, exceptum, inceptum, occeptum, perceptum, præceptum, receptum, susceptum.* Yet as *antecapio*, changes not *a* into *i*, so neither doth *antecaptum* change *a* into *e*. Hence

&c.

lit. 1. de N. Deor. Antecapta animo rei quædam informatio. Unleſs the words be to be read divided.

Factum] Hence *affectum, confectum, defectum, effectum, infectum, offectum, perfectum, præfectum profectum, refectum, ſuffectum, interfectum.* But yet thoſe compounds of *facio*, which are compounded with a *noun, verb*, or *adverb*, and ſo do not change *a* into *i* in their preſent tenſe, do not change *a* into *e* in their ſupines. Hence *floccifactum, naucifactum, calfactum, olfactum, commonefactum, benefactum, malefactum, ſatisfactum.*

Jactum] Hence *abjectum, adjectum, conjectum, dejectum, ejectum, circumjectum, interjectum, præjectum, projectum, ſubjectum, ſuperjectum, trajectum*, &c.

Raptum] Hence *abreptum, arreptum, correptum, direptum, ereptum, præreptum, ſurreptum, proreptum.*

Et cantum] Hence *concentum, incentum, accentum, precentum, præcentum, recentum, occentum, ſuccentum.*

Partum] Hence *apertum, opertum, repertum, compertum.*

Sparſum] Hence *aſperſum, conſperſum, inſperſum, perſperſum, reſperſum, circumſperſum.*

Carptum] Hence *decerptum, excerptum, diſcerptum, concerptum, præcerptum.*

Fartum] Hence *refertum, differtum*; but *effarcio* makes *effartum*, and *infarcio infartum*, ſaith *Stephanus*; perhaps there may be alſo *effertum* and *infertum* as *efferio*, and *infercio* are read; but I have nothing of certainty here in to offer.

Qu. **What is the difference between the Supines of edo, and the compounds thereof?**

An. The difference between the ſupines of *edo*, and of the compounds thereof is this: That though the ſimple verb *edo* make *eſum* and *eſtum*, yet none of the compounds of it do make any more but *eſum* only. Excepa *comedo*, which maketh both *eſum* and *eſtum*:

ſo

So that of *comedo* is formed *comesum* and *comestum*. our Authour:

Verbum edo compositum.

Verbum edo compositum, non estum, sed facit esum:
unum duntaxat comedo formabit utrumque.

¶ *Non estum*] Hence *abesum, adesum, ambesum, exesum, superesum, obesum, p resum, subesum, &c.* Not to find the simple *estum*, unlesse in a *Grammar* or *Dictionary* I conceive will be no easie matter. Yet that such a supine is, or hath been, appears by *comestum* derived from it; if yet any such word as *comestum* may be allowed of, nothing that I meet with, being by our Grammarians alledged for it, but only that *Didymus* speaking of *Sallust* saith, *comesto patrimonio*. What to make of that of *Cato*. c. 157. de R. R. as it is in my Book, I know not. Speaking *de brassicâ* he saith, *Ad salutem temperat comesta sese semper cum calore, & rigore arido, simul & humido, & dulci, & amaro, & acri*. That which follows may perhaps be somewhat to purpose. *Sed quæ vocatur* σελινοειδὴς *hæc septem habet bona in comesturâ*. For whence *comestura*, but from *comestum*? Yet *comesum* may be safer to be used.

Qu. **What is the difference between the simple Supine of** nosco, **and the compounds of it?**

An. The difference between the simple and compound supines of *nosco*, is this: That two of them change *o* in *notum* into *i*, viz. *cognitum* and *agnitum*, the rest differ in nothing from it, ending all in *notum*; as *ignotum, prænotum pernotum*, and *dignotum*. So our Authour saith.

A nosco tantum duo.

A nosco tantum duo cognitum & agnitum habentur:
Cætera dant notum: nullo est jam noscitum in usu.

¶ *A nosco*] *Nosco* is from the ancient *gnosco*, which as *Vossius* saith, *Varro* used for *nosco*: *Adeste, adeste, quæ feramque, gnoscite*. This is from the Greek γινώσκω. Thence comes the g into *ignosco, cognosco, agnosco*, which yet is left out in *prænosco*, and *pernosco*, *Euphoniæ gratiâ*.

Agnitum] Thence *agnitus* is ordinary, for which as *Pris-*

Priſcian teſtifieth, *Pacuvius* uſed *agnotus*; from whence *Salluſt.* l. 2. *Hiſtor.* hath *agnoturus*: both which are now diſuſed.

Catera dant notum] Though anciently *Piſo* in 2. *Annal.* from *ignoſco* hath *ignoſcituros*, yet now the derivatives from *notum* prevail. Thence *ignotus* in *Cicero*, *Virgil*, *Ovid*, *Plaut.* &c. Thence as *Stephanus* quotes it, not only *Cato* l. 3. *Origin.* hath *ignoturus*; *Quod rerum nemo mihi ignoturus eſſet*; but *Cic. in Catone. Ignotum alteri quod patrem, alteri quod tutorem ſecutus eſſet.* See *Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 25.

Nullo eſt jam noſcitum in uſu] Yet anciently as it ſhould ſeem, it hath been in ſome uſe: for thence ſurely came *noſciturus*, allowed of by Grammarians, *Farnaby*, *Hayne*, &c. and thence, ſaith *Voſſius*, came *noſcito*, uſed by *Plaut.* in *Ciſtellar.* 2. 4. ſ. 2. *Nam veſtigia ſique ſunt, noſcitabo*; alſo by *Catullus*, and *Livie* in ſeveral places. But now we have no more uſe of it.

Q. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus: The declining of the words.

Tundo, tundis, tutudi, tundere, tunſum [*& tuſum,*]
Ruo, ruis, rui, ruere, ruitum [*& rutum,*]
Salio, ſalis, ſalui, & ſalii, ſalire, ſaltum,
Sero, ſeris, ſevi, ſerere, ſatum,
Capio, capis, cepi, capere, captum,
Facio, facis, feci, facere, factum,
Jacio, jacis, jeci, jacere, jactum,
Rapio, rapis, rapui, rapere, raptum,
Cano, canis, cecini, canere, cantum,
Pario, paris, peperi, parere, partum,
Spargo, ſpargis, ſparſi, ſpargere, ſparſum,
Carpo, carpis, carpſi, carpere, carptum,
Farcio, farcis, farſi, farcire, fartum,
Edo, edis, vel es, edi, edere, vel eſſe, eſum [*eſtum*]
Comedo, { *comedis,* / *comes* } *comedi,* { *comedere,* / *comeſſe* } { *comeſum* / *comeſtum,*
Noſco, noſcis, novi, noſcere, notum,

Cognosco, cognoscis, cognovi, cognoscere, cognitum, Agnosco, agnoscis, agnovi, agnoscere; agnitum.

Qu. **May there be any thing further added to the Rule?**

An. To this Rule there may yet be something added touching some compounds of *do, sto, plico, mulceo, oleo, and tendo.*

Qu. **What is to be added to this Rule touching the compounds of** do?

An. Touching the compounds of *do*, this is to be added, That those of them which are of the *first* conjugation, do *keep* the vowel of the simple supine, and have *datum*; as *venundo, circundo, satisdo, &c.* But those which are of the *third* conjugation *change* the *a* of the simple supine into *i*, and make *ditum*: as *abdo abditum, addo additum*, &c.

Unless perhaps *abscondo* may be thought fit to be in part excepted, as making, at least having made, not *absconditum* only, the now usual supine, but *absconsum*; whence saith *Vossius*, there is *absconsio* in *Plin. absconsor* in *Jul. Firmicus.* and *absconsè*, λάθρα *in vett. glossis. De Analog.* l. 3. c. 26.

Qu. **What is to be added touching the compounds of** sto?

An. Touching the compounds of *sto* this is to be added, That whereas all the compounds of it, are said to change *a* in the simple supine *statum* into *i*, and make *stitum*, as *asto astitum, consto constitum, &c.* Yet some, if not all of them, do also make *statum*, as *præsto præstatum, consto constatum*, &c.

¶ From *Adsto Amil. Porcina* in *Priscian* l. 9. hath, *Tempore adstiturum, atque petiturum, me abesse.* So from *præsto Cic. Fam.* 6. 8. hath, *Se præstituros, nihil ex eo te offensionis habiturum. Id. ad Brut. ut non dubitem, quin se præstiturus fuerit acerrimum propugnatorem communis libertatis.*

Touching *circumsto* Writers differ; Some give it no supine, as *Rhenius* and the *Gryphisw. Grammar. Stephanus*

phanus gives it *circumſtitum*. *Hayne* in his Grammar excepts it not from his general Rule of, *Dant ſtatum atque ſatum compoſta ſtitumque ſitumque.* No more doth *Deſpauterius*, who down-right ſaith, *Stetit atque ſtatum ſto, Cujus compoſitum ſtiti atque ſtatum capit apte.* Whom his Expoſitor *Sebaſtian Duisburgenſis* follows κατὰ πόδα, ſaying, *ſto ſteti ſtatum, Hujus compoſita ſtitum faciunt, ut præſto præſtitum, inſto inſtitum.* But Mr. *Shirley* gives it *circumſtatum* for its ſupine: and with him ſeems to be Mr. *Farnaby* and his follower Mr. *Burles* (if they allow it any ſupine at all, for they name none) for after declining *ſto, ſteti, ſtatum*, and *circumſto circumſteti*, they ſay, *Cætera compoſita ſtiti* and *ſtitum*, the reſt of the compounds have *ſtiti* and *ſtitum*; ſo that this with them, hath *ſtatum*, or nothing. And that *ſtatum* it hath, or hath had whatever be of *ſtitum*, is a little viſible from *circumſtatio* the verbal derived from it. This *Gell.* l. 7. c. 4. hath, *Milites cuſtodiæ cauſâ, captivorum venalium greges circumſtarent: atque circumſtatio militum corona appellata ſit.*

Whether *ſuperſto* have *ſuperſtatum* may be doubted; For though *Voſſius* ſay peremptorily of the compounds of *ſto, in ſupino ſæpius habent A longum; varius I breve*; (quite contrary to the ſtream of vulgar Grammarians) Yet I neither find *ſuperſtatum*, nor *ſuperſtatus*, nor *ſuperſtatio*, nor any derivative from it of that ſort. But as from *ſuperſtitum* I find *ſuperſtito* and *ſuperſtitio*. And *Rhenius* having declined it with *itum*, adds *reliqua compoſita habent atum & itum.* So that it ſeems more probable that it hath *itum* only, and not *atum*. *Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 20. *Rhen.* p. 170.

That *præſto* maketh *præſtatum*, is evident from abundance of inſtances in the derivatives from it. *Claudian* in his *Phœnix* hath, *Præſtatura novas vires incendia nutrit. Cic. ad Att.* l. 14. *Ep.* 19. *Puto, ſiquid pudoris in homine eſt, præſtaturum eum, ne pro ſe quodammodo dependatur. Brut.* in his *Ep.* to *Cicero* in *Priſcian* l. 9. *Oc-*

ciſo C. Cæſare, poſtquam mare tranſierat, præſtatum eſt. Many places more of ſeveral Authours are quoted by *Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 20. And ſaith he, what we have ſeen in *præſto*, that alſo hath place in *conſto*, and the like. As *Lucan.* l. 2. *Conſtatura fides ſuperûm. Martial.* l. 10. *Ep.* 41. *Conſtatura fuit Megalenſis purpura centum Milibus. Plin.* l. 18. c. 5. *ut fructus is maximè probaretur, qui quàm minimo impendio conſtaturus eſſet. Plin.* l. 12 c. 22. *Exſtatura etiamnum duabus gemmis. Quinct.* l. 2. c. 12. *Video quoſdam in ipſo ſtatim limine obſtaturos mihi. Frontin.* l. 1. c. 12. *Fugientibus inſtaturos victores.* Yet as from *inſtitum* is read *inſtito. Cæſar.* 1. b. g. *Qui in montem ſeſe receperant, rurſus inſtitare, & prælium redintegrare cœperunt.* But here copies vary, and ſome have *inſtare.* So that whatever others ſay, without proof, as far as proof appears, that of *Alvarus*, whom *Voſſius* follows is true,——

A ſto ſtecte ſteti, ſtatum: ſtiti at inde profecta
Atque ſtitum cupiunt, multo ſed crebrius atum.

Qu. **What is to be added touching the compounds** of plico?

An. Touching the compounds of *plico* this is to be added, That though the ſimple ſupine of it be *plicatum*, yet thoſe compounds of it which have *plicui* in their preterperfect tenſe as well as *plicavi*, all or moſt have *plicitum* alſo as well as *plicatum* in their Supines, as *applico, implico & explico.*

As from *applicavi applicatum* is *applicatus*; whence *Cæſ.* 3. b. *Civ. Applicatiſque noſtris ad terram navibus.* So from *applicui applicitum* is *applicitus. Sil.* l. 15. *Proximus applicito ſaxoſis aggere ſylvis Tendebat. Plin.* ep. 41. *Applicitum eſt cubiculo hypocauſtum perexiguum.* Again, as of *explicavi explicatum* is *explicatus, Cic. pro Planc. Mihi in cauſâ facili atque explicata perdifficilis & lubrica defenſionis ratio proponitur. Cæſ.* 3. b. c. *His explicatis rebus, duas in caſtris legiones retinuit. Martial.* l. 14. ep. 1. *Virſibus explicitum eſt omne duobus opus.*

As

As also from *implicavi implicatum* is *implicatus. Cic. 5. Verr. Tu qui omnibus legibus implicatus tenebare, libidinem tibi tuam pro lege esse voluisti?* So from *implicui implicitum* is *implicitus. Plin.* l. 3. ep. 9. *Quæ sicut implicita suspicionibus, ita non satis convinci probationibus visa est.* Of *complicavi complicatum* I find *complicitus. Cic.* 3. *offic. Si quis volverit animi sui complicationem evolvere, jam se ipse doceat.* But *complicitum* or any thing from it, I yet find not.

Qu. **What is to be added touching the compounds of** mulceo?

An. Touching the compounds of *mulceo* this is to be added, That though *mulceo* have only *mulsum*, yet *permulceo* one compound of it, hath both *permulsum* and *permulctum*. From *permulsum* is *permulsus.* Hence that of *Cicero in contentione Metelli*, as *Stephanus* cites it, *Permulsa atque recreata.* From *permulctum* is *permulctus.* Hence that of *Sall.* 4. *Histor. Dein lenita jam irâ, posterâ die liberalibus verbis permulcti sunt.* See above, *L vel R ante Geo.*

Qu. **What is to be added touching the compounds of** oleo?

An. Touching the compounds of *oleo*, this is to be added: That though the simple verb *oleo, olui* have *olitum*, yet *exoleo exolevi* hath *exoletum*, *obsoleo obsolevi obsoletum*, and *adoleo adolevi adultum*: and *inoleo* hath no supine.

¶ From *exolevi exoletum* comes the Participle *exoletus. Quintil.* l. 8 *tot si quis exoletus scrutatus authores idipsum petat.* And thence the Substantive *exoletus. Cic. pro Mil. Ille qui semper secum scorta semper exoletos, semper lupas ducebat.* From *obsoletum* of *obsolevi* comes *obsoletus. Cic.* 3. *Verr. Nimis antiqua hæc & jam obsoleta sunt.* And from *adultum* of *adolevi* comes *adultus. Virg.* 4. *Georg. Aliæ spem gentis adultos Educunt fœtus. Cic. in Catilin. Extinguetur atque delebitur non modò hæc tam adulta reipublicæ pestis*— But *aboleo* hath *abolitum*, Whence *Quintil.* l. 1. c. 9. *Sed abolita atque abrogata*

rogata retinere impudentiæ est. And so in the rest *redoleo, suboleo, oboleo, peroleo.*

Qu. **What is to be added touching the compounds of** tendo?

An. Touching the compounds of *tendo* this is to be added, That whereas the simple verb *tendo* hath both *tentum* and *tensum* two compounds of it, *viz. attendo* and *contendo* have only *tentum*, but the rest follow the simple having both, yet *tentum* more usually, except *ostendo*, which more usually hath *ostensum.*

¶ From *attentum* of *attendo* comes *attentus, attentio* and *attentè* ordinarily read. And from *contentum* of *contendo* comes *contentus, contentio,* and *contentè.* But I meet with nothing derived from *attensum* or *contensum* as yet. But from *intentum* of *intendo* comes *intentus. Cic.* 3. *de Orat. Voces, ut chordæ, sunt intentæ.* And from *intensum intensus. Cic. Orat. Principia verecunda, non elatis intensa verbis, sed acuta sententiis.* So from *extentum* of *extendo* comes *extentus. Colum.* l. 5. *Quare ad summum palum recta vitis extenta est, capistro constringitur.* From *extensum* comes *extensus. Cic.* 4. *Acad. Quum extensis digitis animadversam manum ostenderat, visum inquiebat hujusmodi*— Of *prætentum* from *prætendo* is read *prætentus. Ovid. Met.* 3. *Instantiaque ora retardat Cuspide prætentâ.* And from *protentum* of *protendo* is read *protentus. Tacit.* l. 14. *Eques protentis hastis perfringit, quod obvium & validum erat.* But though our *Lexicographers* and *Grammarians* give *prætensum* and *protensum* as well as *prætentum* and *protentum* for supines to these verbs, yet I see, as yet, little to induce them so to do, unless it be the analogy of other the like words. Though again *ostensum* of *ostendo* is more usual, whence in *Lucan.* l. 2. *Ut scelus hoc Scyllæ cædesque ostensa placeret:* Yet of *ostentum* is read *ostentus* in *Varro* l. 1. r. r. c. 25. *Qui locus optimus vino sit, & ostentus soli;* Which yet *Diomedes* reads *lacus*--*obtentus soli.* So *Cato de* r. r. c. 6. *Ager oleto conserundo qui in ventum favonium spectabit, & soli ostentus erit,*

alius

alius bonus nullus erit. And in his *Orat.* for *L. Cæsar*, he, as *Priscian* l. 9. observes, hath, *Quod ego me spero ostenturum.* But finding it in none but old Authours, suffice it that it hath been, though now it may not be, in use. However thence is derived *ostentum* as *Priscian* observed; and *ostentus* the verbal substantive, yet out of use now; in all but the Dative case *ostentui*, and that used chiefly if not only, by *Historians*, *Sallust*, and *Tacitus*. See *Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 26. and *Danes. Schol.* l. 2. c. 12.

Qu. **May not something be added of the compounds of** sisto ?

An. Of the compounds of *sisto* this some add: That if they have any supine, it is *stitum*: but that it is better to forbear them.

¶ There is found in *Ulpian exstiturus* of *existo*. *Si diu incertum hæres exstiturus necne sit.* Thence is the conjecture of *stitum* being the supine of those verbs, which are compounded of *sisto*: and it is not irrational.

And thus far of the Rules, which the Grammar gives, for the *Preterperfect* tenses and *Supines* of Verbs in *O*, whether simple or compounded.

CHAP. XI.

Qu. **WE are now come to the Rule for the Preterperfect tenses of Verbs in *Or*: what is the Rule for the Preterperfect tenses of those Verbs?**

An. The Rule for the Preterperfect tenses of Verbs in *Or* is this:

De præteritis verborum in Or.

Verba in or *admittunt ex posteriore supino Præteritum, verso u per us, & sum consociato Vel fui: ut a lectu, lectus sum vel fui.*

Verba in or *admittunt.*

Qu. What is the meaning of this Rule?

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That the preterperfect tense of a verb in *or* is formed from the latter supine by adding *s* thereto, and joyning therewith in construction *fum*, or *fui*. As from *lectu* the latter supine of *lego*, by adding *s* to it, is made *lectus*; and that with *fum* or *fui* stands for a preterperfect tense to the verb *legor*.

¶ Verbs in *or* have no regular preterperfect tense of their own; therefore to supply that want, they have a periphrastical preterperfect tense made for them, consisting of the participle of the preter tense (which indeed is formed of the latter Supine by putting *s* to it) and the verb *fum* or *fui*, accordingly as reason requires. For though they be looked upon by some as indifferent, and are sometimes used one for another, yet in strictness they differ: as *Amissus est, qui adhuc desideratur; Amissus fuit, qui jam est inventus.* So *Vienna obsessa fuit, non obsessa est. Rhen.* p. 238.

Qu. What is the meaning of that Note annexed to the Rule? viz.

At horum, Nunc est deponens, nunc est commune notandi?

At horum, Nunc est deponens.

An. The meaning of that Note is this: That all verbs in *or*, which have a preterperfect tense formed from the latter supine, are not passives, but some are *deponents*, and some are *commons*.

¶ *Deponents* are such verbs as formerly under the one termination of a passive, did signifie both actively and passively, but now have laid down their passive signification, and signifie only actively. *Commons* are such as under the one termination of a passive, have the signification both of the active and the passive. Properly none but actives have supines: from thence passives have their preterperfect tenses formed. But deponents and commons have also preterperfect tenses formed from the supines of actives, which either have been, but now are disused (such as *adulo, comito, consolo, crimino, digno, frustro, horto, auguro, amplexo*, &c. From whence *adu-*

lor,

lor, comitor, conſolor, criminor, dignor, fruſtror, hortor, auguror, amplexor,) or elſe may be imagined to be, or have been; ſo as that to form *veritus ſum* to be a preterperfect tenſe to the deponent verb *vereor*, we muſt imagine ſuch a verb as *vereo, verui, veritum*, from whoſe ſupine we may form that preterperfect tenſe. And ſo to form *lapſus ſum vel fui* a preterperfect tenſe for the deponent verb *labor*, we muſt imagine ſuch a verb as *labo, lapſi, lapſum*, from whoſe latter ſupine that preterperfect tenſe may be formed. The like may be ſaid of *patior paſſus ſum*, for the forming of which, we muſt imagine ſuch an active verb, as *patio, paſſi, paſſum*, like *quatio, quaſſi, quaſſum*. And ſo of the reſt.

Qu. **What do you conceive to be the meaning of the Authour in adding theſe ſo many verbs in** *or*, **as hereafter are named, to the Rule?**

An. The meaning of the *Authour*, in adding theſe ſo many verbs in *or* unto this Rule for the forming of their preterperfect tenſes, I conceive to be this: *Partly* to ſhew their being formed from real or imaginary Actives, and *partly* to note the irregularities of them, or the compounds of them in their formation or compoſition, there being few, if any, here, but what in ſome reſpect or other are irregular-- So our *Authour*——

Nam labor lapſus, patior dat paſſus & ejus
Nata, ut compatior compaſſus, perpetiorque
Formans perpeſſus, fateor quod faſſus & inde
Nata, ut confiteor confeſſus, &c.

Nam labor lapſus] Anciently they wrote *labſus* (as *Voſſius* obſerves.) *Ita*, ſaith he, *Pierius in vett. codd. labſus legi ait* in 3. *Georg.* & *elabſus* 1. *Georg. idque ex Probi præſcripto, qui elabſus, prolabſus, labſantem per B. ſcribere jubet.* But that way of writing is now out of uſe. Hither refer *allabor, delabor, dilabor, elabor, collabor, illabor, prolabor, ſublabor, relabor.*

Fateor quod faſſus, &c.] So *profiteor. Auſonius Popma* (l. 1. *de uſu Antiquæ Locutionis*, c. 11.) ſhews out of *Cic. Agrar.* 2. that *fateor* hath alſo had a paſſive ſignification,

nification, *Excipere nominatim agrum, qui publicus non fatcatur.* And ſo though now it be a deponent, yet formerly it was a common.

Gradior dat greſſus, &c.] So *aggredior, egredior, ingredior, regredior.* Of *gradior* formerly, ſaith *Rhenius* was *graſſus*, whence *graſſor graſſaris*; *Greſſus* now only remains. This verb is now of the third conjugation. Whence *Plaut. in Truc.* 1. 2. *Tu ſer contra manum, & pariter gradere.* So *Pſeud.* 4. 7. *Si gradavere tantum, quantum, loquere, jamiſſes ad forum.* But anciently it hath been of the fourth. Whence *Plaut. Truc.* 2 5. *Quæ cauſa ſum tantum clam dolum aggrediri.* So *Pacuvius* in *Feſtus*, *Aggreditur aſtu regem: manticulandum eſt hic mihi.* Whereon (ſaith *Voſſius*) *Verſus eſt Trochaicus, ut tertia ſyllaba ſit correcta. De Analog.* l. 3. c. 25.

Junge fatiſcor feſſus ſum] This verb *Rhenius* looks upon as an antiquated word. And *Alvarus* freely confeſſes, *Fatiſcor, quod quidam putant feſſus ſum facere, nondum potui invenire.* Only he tells you of *fatiſcor* ſaid to be made of *fateor* by *Gellius* l. 7. c. 2. where ſome body, but how rightly I know not, read *fatiſco.* Yet of that verb every body may read *defetiſcor* in *Ter. Phorm.* 4. 3. *Neque adeo defetiſcar unquam exoriri, donec.* But againſt either this or that making *feſſus*, or *defeſſus* in the preterperfect tenſe (though *Priſcian*, and thoſe that follow him, allow of it, as *Deſpauterius*, *Hayne*, *Bird*, *Shirley*) not only was *Diomedes* of old (l. 1.) but *Rhenius*, *Voſſius*, *Alvarus*, *Daneſius*, and *Farnaby* of late are. And though *feſſus* and *defeſſus ſum* be read, (as this latter is in *Ter. Ad.* 4. 6.) *Defeſſus ſum ambulando*, yet in the opinion of *Alvarus feſſus* and *defeſſus* are nouns, (and with him do therein conſent, the two eminent Grammarians of High and Low *Germany*, *Rhenius* and *Voſſius*,) and that therefore *defetiſcor* wants the preterperfect tenſe: and no marvel, for *fatiſcor* doth ſo, and muſt, if *feſſus* be a noun; and how ſhould it do other, being derived, as *Voſſius* ſaith, from *fatiſco*, which hath no preterperfect tenſe. See *Alvar.* p. 253.

Rhen.

Rhen. p. 217. *Voſſ. Etymolog.* Lit. p. 112. *Danet. Schol.* l. 3. c. 14.

Menſus ſum metior] So *dimetior*, *remetior*. Some would have this verb to have *metitus ſum*: as reading in *Cic.* l. 2. *de Nat. Deor. dimetita figura*. But the better Editions have *demetata*. They quote alſo *Curt.* l. 3. for *ſtipendium metitum eſt*; but *Voſſius* ſaith he could find nothing like it there. True in l. 5. may be read paſſively *ſtipendium menſum*, but that's not the buſineſs; but quite againſt it. *Scaliger* himſelf, if he uſe the word, as *Voſſius* ſaith he doth ll. *de cauſſ.* L. L. c. 91. muſt have a better Authority for it, before we receive it. *Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 33.

Utor & uſus] So *abutor*, and *coutor* found in the Gloſſaries, if it may be uſed. Anciently there was *uto*, yet read in *Cato* de r. r. c. 96. Where, ſaith that Author, *Eodem modo in omnes quadrupedes utito, ſi ſcabra erunt.* From *uſum* the ſupine of that verb formed from *uſi*, like *verſum* from *verti* of *verto*, is formed *uſus*. That *utor* was anciently common, *Gellius* ſaith l. 15. c. 13. His words are, *utor & vereor & hortor, & conſolor, communia verba ſunt, & utroque verſu dici poſſunt: verteris te, & vereor abs te, id eſt tu me vereris. utor te, & utor abs te, id eſt tu me uteris.* The paſſive uſe he avoucheth upon the Authority of *Novius*. *Quia ſupellex multa, quæ non utitur, emitur tamen: id eſt quæ uſus non eſt.* *Voſſius* alſo from *Priſcian* cites *Ou. Hortenſius* ſaying. *Abuſis jam ab omnibus locis*; and *Varro*, *utile uamur potius, quàm ab Rege abutamur.* But theſe Authorities will hardly bring the Paſſive uſing theſe words into uſe again.

Protexo orditus, pro incepto dat ordior orſus] Diverſe of our *Engliſh* Grammarians, as *Hayne*, *Bird*, *Harris*, and the *Rudiment-Writer*, have both *orditus*, and *orſus*, and alſo the *Gryphiſw. Grammar.* But *Rhenius* and *Deſpauterius*, *Alvarus* and *Voſſius*, *Farnaby* and *Shirley* have only *orſus*. Not but that *orditus* hath been in uſe. (For *Voſſius* quotes *ordita lectio* from *Diomedes* l. 1.)

I. 1.) but that *orditus* is now grown out of use. As for our Authours distinction of *orditus pro texo*, and *orsus pro incepto*, though followed herein by those, that would pretend to correct his errours, and as it may seem, favoured by that of *Stephanus*, *Orditus præteritum, ad telæ vel alterius hujusmodi compositionem spectat*, yet I see no ground for it. And the forementioned quotation out of *Diomedes* [*ordita lectio*] overthrows it. That *ordior* hath been used as a passive anciently, that of *Columel.* (l. 1. c. 5. sheweth. *Cum ex loco depressiore fuerint orsa fundamenta, non solùm superficiem suam facilè sustinebunt, sed*— *Exordior* the compound of it (*proprium verbum artis Minervæ*, as *Pareus* in his *Lexicon Plautinum* saith) hath *exorsus* only, what ever *orsus* have, of which yet I should be loth to use any more than so, till better authority appeared for it. Perhaps the *weaving* sense is the proper sense of the word: though the sense to *begin*, being but Metaphorical have out-grown it, and out-worn it too.

Nitor nisus vel nixus sum] *Rem miram!* The Grammarians are agreed, that *nitor* maketh *nisus* and *nixus*. But, saith *Alvarus*, *Nixus frequentissimum est, nisus rarius*, Yet he produceth an Authourity for that out of *Vitruvius* l. 1. c. 2. *ut architectus his literis imbutus hoc usus sum scribere. Vossius* produceth another out of *Tacit.* l. 1. *Anal. Seque inferre monitoribus nisi.* The like is produced for *annitor. Tacit.* l. 3. *Latonam partu gravidam, & oleæ quæ tum etiam manent, adnisam, edidisse ea numina.* So *Liv.* l. 5. *ab urbe. Et patres reficere interessores legis annisi sunt.* Id. l. 4. *Patres summa ope annisi sunt.* Id. l. 2. *ab urbe Annisurum ut appareat exilio sibi iratos esse non fractos animos. Id.* l. 4. *dec.* 5. *Illud affirmare pro certo habeo, audeoque, me omni opè adnisurum esse, ne*— The like for *enitor. Id.* l. *Enisaque legiones. Cic. ad Qu. Fr.* l. 3. *In quo enitar non minus quàm sum enisus in nostro. Cæs.* 2. b. c. *Brutus celeritate navis enisus est, ut parvo momento antecederit.* But there is read of them both *annixus*, and *enixus*: the former

former in *Virgil.* 1. *Æn. Cymothoe simul & Triton adnixus acuto Detrudunt naves scopulo.* So *Liv.* l. 8. *ab urbe. Quod annixus pro se quisque sit.* The latter in *Sall. Jugurth. Ab adolescentiâ ita se enixum, ut ab optimo quoque probaretur.* By which place by the way is overthrown that errour, which some Grammarians are in; viz. that *enixus ad partum spectat, enisus ad cæteros conatus* as *Alvarus* saith, and so *Rhenius*, whom *Hayne* follows therein. For the Authour speaks of no such thing as *partus* there. And besides in the place of *Tacit.* l. 3. produced before *Latonam partu gravidam*, &c. *adnisam* is used *de partu.* The distinction may hold much, but it is not universal. Other compounds of *nitor* rather have *nixus*, as *innitor, connitor, obnitor, pernitor, subnitor, renitor.* Thence *obnixus*, from whence *obnixe: pernixus*, whence *pernix*; *connixus*, (though in *Tacit.* be read *conisus* &c. *Alvar.* p. 255. *Vos. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 38. *Rhen.* p. 218. *Danes. Schol.* l. 2. c. 14.

Ulciscor & ultus] This verb was anciently used as a passive. *Sall. Jug. Quicquid sine sanguine civium ulciscitur, jure factum sit.* So *Valer. Flacc.* useth *ultus* passively, l. 4. *Argonaut.* And no marvel, when there was in being an active *ulciscor*, which *Ennius* in *Eumenid.* hath, *Nisi patrem materno sanguine exantlando ulciscerem.* But the active verb, and passive sense are now laid down, and the verb is used as a deponent.

Irascor simul iratus] This verb is used like a verb in its preterperfect tense. *Plaut. Pœn.* 3. 3. *Hunc chlamydatum quem vides, ei Mars iratus est. Id. Truc.* 2. 6. *Vehementer nunc mihi est irata.* And the generality of Grammarians quarrel it not. Yet *Vossius* and *Rhenius* think *iratus* a noun like *fretus*, and the like. No doubt but all, or most participles sometimes are used like nouns. But we must not thence say that all participles, or those that are so used are nouns. But let every man have his liberty of opining for me.

Reor atque ratus sum] This verb hath no participle of the *present* tense, *future* in *dur*, or *future* in *rus. Dat*

rat us

rutus tantum ſaith the acute *Saturnius* l. 6. c. 5. The vulgar Grammarians take no notice of this that I ſee.

Obliviſcor vult oblitus ſum] This verb, it ſhould ſeem by *Voſſius*, was anciently of paſſive ſignification alſo. Thence *Virgil* 9. *Eclog. Nunc oblita mihi tot carmina.* The old *Scholiaſt* on *Juven. Sat.* 7 v. 51. explains *Scribendi cacoethes*, to be *mala conſuetudo ſcribendi, qua obliviſci non poteſt.* And there, ſaith *Voſſius* it is to be taken paſſively. *De Analog* l. 3. c. 6. But the active uſe now prevails, ſo that the verb is looked upon as a deponent.

Fruor optat fructus vel fruitus] *Fruitus* is found in *Gellius* l. 17. c. 2. but from *Novius*. *Qui non parſit, apud te fruitus eſt.* And in *Ulpian* l. 29 *Non meo nomine, ſed ſuo, fruitus eſt emtor.* From the ſame Authour *Priſcian* l. 9. quotes *fruiturus*. Which even *Saturnius* allows of; and good reaſon, being read in *Cicero*, 3 *Tuſc. Xeno ſtoicorum acutiſſimus contendere magnâ voce ſolebat, eum eſſe beatum, qui præſentibus voluptatibus frueretur, confideretque ſe fruiturum. Fructus* hath alſo been in uſe. It is found in *Lucret.* l. 3. *Sin ea quæ fructus cunque es periere profuſa.* Thence *Priſcian* l. 10. cites *Cicero* in *Hortenſ.* ſaying, *Summâ amœnitate perfructus eſt.* And *Lucretius* l. 3. hath *Omnia perfructus vitai præmia marces.* But the uſe of this is rare. *Rari fructus*, ſaith *Hayne*. But *fructurus* is not read at all, if *Saturnius* may be believed. *Fructus namque, fruitus, & fruiturus dicitur, non autem fructurus*, So *Saturnius*. l. 6. c. 5. and *Voſſius* ſaith, *Fructurus pro fruiturus dixit Appuleius*, but he names nor words, nor place. But it may be found in *Stewichius* notes on that Authour, where he reſtores that word in *Panegyr. Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 32. *Joſeph Scaliger* in his *Conjectan.* upon *Varro* p. 181. produces a place in *Varro*, where *fruor* is paſſively uſed, at leaſt as he reads it, and interprets it. *Fructus aferendo res, & hæ quas fundus, & hæ quæ in fundo ferunt, ut fruantur.* Thus he reads the Authour: now it is,

is, ut fruamur. But as he reads it, ſo he takes it paſſively, appealing to Grammarians for it, that the ancients uſed *frui* paſſively alſo. I had rather he had produced Authours to juſtifie Grammarians: whoſe words are ſlippery things many times without Authours to vouch them. See *Daneſ. Schol.* l. 2. c. 14. Hither may be referred *fruiſcor*, derived from *fruor*, and anciently uſed for it. Whence *Næv.* in *Gell.* l. 17. c. 2. *Id fruiſci non queunt.*

Miſereri junge miſertus] *Miſertus* is by a *Syncope* made of *miſeritus*: For thence is *miſeritum eſt* read in *Ter. Heaut.* 3. 1. *Ut me tuarum miſeritum eſt fortunarum.* So *Phorm.* 3. 2. and *Hec.* 3. 3. And that from *miſeo* ſure, (whence remains the impersonal *miſeret*, uſed in *Plaut. Captiv.* 3. 5. 106. *Mei miſeret neminem. Ter. Phor.* 1. 4. *Ejus me miſeret*) though no ſuch word be now in uſe.

Vult tuor & tueor non tutus, ſed tuitus ſum, Quamvis & tutum, & tuitum ſit utrique ſupinum] *Tuor* is a kind of antiquated verb, at leaſt ſo looked upon by ſome. Yet it is read both ſimple, and compounded. *Simple* in *Ovid. de morte Druſi*, cited by *Daneſius*, *Nunc ego te infelix ſummum teneoque tuorque. Schol.* 2. l. 13. c. So *Var.* l. 6. de L. L. *Quocirca cœlum qua tuimur, dictum templum.* ib. *Et intra eas regiones, qua oculi conſpicient, id eſt tuimur. Compounded* with *in* 'tis found in *Senec. Agam.* 5. 2. *Amici fida preſidia intuor.* So *Ter. Heaut.* 1. 4. *Quiſnam hic adoleſcens, qui intuitur nos? Papin. Stat. Theb.* l. 3. *Armigeras ſummi Jovis exultante caterva Intuor. Plaut. Moſtell.* 3. 2. 150. *Profectò nullam quidam ilic cornicem intuor.* With *con* in *Lucret.* l. 4. *In ſomnis ſæpe figuras Contuimur miras. Plaut. Moſtel.* 3. 2. 152. *Volturios forte poſſis contui. Id. Aſin.* 1. 1. v. 111. *Illud argentum tam paratum filio ſcio eſſe quàm me hunc Scipionem contui.* But *tueor* and the compounds of it are more ordinary; yea *tueri* in the ſimple alwaies, *tui* never. *Virg.* 1. *Æn. Fines cuſtode tueri. Plaut. Trus.* 1. 1. *Qui alterum incuſat probri, ipſum ſe intueri oportet.*

portet. Cic. 4. de N. Deor. Similiter facis ac si me roga-
cur te duobus contuear oculis. Id. 1. Tusc. Quid
tandem spectaculum fore putamus, quum totam terra
contueri licebit? Plaut. Mostell. 3. 2. At tu istic ad
obtuere. ib. Ætate non quis obtuerier. Id. Amph. Inimi-
cos ossa sum obtuerier. Id. Bacch. 4. 4. Num qui numi
exciderunt heri tibi quod sic terram obtuere? Tuitus
in Plin. l. 6. Epist. Tuitus sum Julium Bassum. Quinct.
pro Cæc. Tuitus sum adolescentis miseri causam. Quinct.
l. 7. Id consequemur si intuiti fuerimus, quæ sit lex, qui
litem faciat. From contuitus the participle comes the
verbal substantive contuitus in Plin. l. 11. c. 37. Oculi
contuitu multiformes. Cic. pro Sestio. Vester iste in me ani-
morum, oculorumque contuitus. Laurent. Valla Elegant.
l. 1. c. 38. reckons tutus amongst the Participles, saying
Tutus dicatur portus, tuta urbs, quod tueatur aliis, non
quod ab aliis defendatur. And yet oftentimes he saith
it is taken passively as applied to men, as Tutus sum ab
hostibus, quod munitus & sine periculosum. But Rhenius
and Danesius will have tutus a noun, not a participle, be-
ing never read as a participle in any Classick Authour,
but oft as a noun. But if there be such a word as obtutus
a verbal substantive, then there should seem to have
been at least such a participle as obtutus, and so tutus
whereof it is compounded. And that of Cic. 1. Off. Ex
oculorum obtuitu, ex elevatione, aut remissione supercili-
orum, Stephanus saith the more correct Copies read ob-
tutu. But however it were, it hath it seems left off to be
a participle, either in simple, or compounded word: and
tuitus is the only word remaining in use. Yea tutum
from tuor Alvarus expresly saith is not in use, and then
sure not tutus (as our Authour here delivers, non tutus,
sed tuitus) nor tuturus. But if not tutus to either tuor
or tueor, then why tutum as well as tuitum to both?
[Quamvis & tutum & tuitum sit utrique supinum.]
Perhaps this may be the meaning of our Authour, not
that both tuor hath tutum and tuitum, and tueor tutum
and tuitum, as the words seem to sound, but that they
both

both have, of both that which is proper unto each, *tuor tutum* and *tueor tuitum*. And so 'tis true, the latter hath, the former hath had that, which here is given unto it. If this be not it, then I know not what it is, unless this, that some compound have both the signification of *tuor* and *tueor*, and so be thought to have also the formation of both: and so *tutum* and *tuitum* will be *utrique supinum*, or rather supines to that one compound verb, but in different respects; the one as it is taken in the notion of *seeing*, and the other as in the notion of *defending*: and it *Rhenius* hit right, one verb there is, that is so taken, and but one, and that is *contuor*, *quod*, as he saith, *videre & defendere significat.* p. 182. If any else can better untie this knot, I shall be glad of it. In the mean time this we may note concerning these verbs, that they are properly Deponents, as having laid down that passive signification, which, as *Priscian.* l. 7. saith, they formerly had. *Alvarus* went about to shew this from a passage of *Seneca* Ep. 91. *Infirmiores a validioribus tuebantur.* But, (and see what 'tis to defend a good cause on bad grounds) *Vossius* saith he is deceived, because *infirmiores* here is the accusative case, and therefore *tueri* is taken actively, *ut sententia sit, priscis seculis principatum eos meritis sui inter homines obtinuisse, qui infirmiores tuerentur adversus validiorum injurias.* With the like success the same *Alvarus* produceth another passage out of *Livie* l. 22. to the same purpose, *Melita a Carthaginensibus tuebatur.* For saith *Vossius*, the passage in the Author is read thus, *Ipse in insulam Melitam, quæ a Carthaginensibus tenebatur, trajecit. Saturnius* to a title hath the same mistake that *Vossius* chargeth *Alvarus* with. *Mers. Major.* l. 1. c. 35. It may be wondred how both, or either of those two so learned persons, should so mistake: Yet the thing is true, for *Vossius* himself proves it from *Varro* de r. r. l. 3. c. 1. *Quod & in pace a rusticis Romani alebantur, & in bello ab his tuebantur.* *Ausonius Popma* l. 1. *de usu Antiq. Locut.* c. 11.

hath the same proof: and adds from *Julian* l. 21. *Digestor. Consilio & operâ curatoris tueri debet non solùm patrimonium, sed & corpus & salus furiosi.* Also an old *Inscription, Pareant ergo, & noscant omnes, Senatus & Populi Romani Imperium Deorum numine, & militum fortitudine & tueri. & regi.* To which let me ad this from *Saturnius* out of *Senec. l. de Morib. Omnes dies, velut ultimus, intueantur. Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 6.

A loquor adde locutus] This verb both *Popma* and *Vossius* observe to be used passively by *Cælius* in his 8. Ep. to *Cicero, De damnatione ferventer loqui est cœptum.* I dare not stand by them in their observation, but leave it to others to consider of: but methinks *loqui est cœptum sc. ab illis*, is no more than *loqui cœperunt.*

Experior facit expertus] So *comperior*, as the *Gram.* of *Gryphiswal.* (fol. 51. a) saith, hath *compertus sum.* This indeed *Auson. Popma* l. 1. *de usu Antiq. Locut.* proves to be used in active sense, under a passive ending, and so to be a *Deponent*, from *Sall. Jug. Sed ego comperior Bocchum magis Punicâ fide, quàm ob ea quæ prædicabat, simul Romanos & Numidam spe pacis detinuisse.* So *Tacit. Historiar.* l. 4. *Gravem & sapientem virum fuisse comperior.* So *Appul. Apolog.* 1. *Ibi ego comperior omnes judices tanto poetæ adsurrexisse.* But *Vossius* denies it to have any other preterperfect tense but *comperi*, borrowed from *comperio*, saying *Compertus sum passivè sum tus, non active*, unless in *Tertullian*, who *adverf. Hermog.* c. 28. hath, *unde ergo compertus est Hermogenes informem & confusam illam* [*materiam*] *fuisse.* Id. l. 4. *adv. Marcion. Quo die (David) ipse compertus est veniam, jejunii dico.* But had it been found in any *Classic Authour*, *Stephanus* would have gone near to have found it: but He in his *Thesaurus*, in this active sense gives *comperior* no preterperfect tense. But that *opperior* (to be added hither also) hath *oppertus sum*, and in *Active* sense too, appears from *Ter. Phorm.* 3. 2. *Quam præterea horam ne oppertus fies.* For which *oppe-*

ritus

ritus is read in *Plaut. Moſtell.* 3. 2. *ſeni otium non erat: id ſum opperitus*, in whom alſo is read *opperibor*. *Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 33.

Formare paciſcor gaudet pactus ſum] Hence *Sueton. de clar. Gram.* c. 7. *Nec usquam de mercedibus* (which in *Stephanus* through miſtake is read *mercibus*) *pactus, eoque plura ex liberalitate diſcentium conſecutus.* Hither add *depaciſcor*, as ſome, or *depeciſcor*, as others would have it written. In *Ulpian* ſome Editions read *devactus*, ſome *depectus*: and thence is the difference. *Alvarus* prefers the former, and ſo *Voſſius*, as finding in *Cic.* l. 2. *de Invent. Depactus eſt cum eo, ut arma & impedimenta relinqueret. Voſſius* by ſundry inſtances ſhews *pactus* of *paciſcor* to be uſed paſſively. *Tacit.* l. 2. *Annal. Silani filia Neroni, vetuſtiſſimo liberorum ejus pacta erat. Hor.* l. 3. od. 3. *Ex quo deſtituit Deos mercede pacta Laomedon*, &c. And no wonder *paciſco* an active being read in *Nonius* out of *Nævius* b. Pun. l. 2. *Id quoq; paciſcunt, ut mania ſint, quæ Lutatium conciliant. Id Captivos plurimos Siculenſes paciſcit, obſides ut reddant. Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 7 and 5. and 25. and *lib.* 4. c. 11. *Alvar.* p. 254. *Rhen.* p. 217.

Nanciſcor nactus] Of this *Saturnius* cites an example from *Lactant.* l. 6. *Si ducem nactus fuerit, qui dirigat ad meliora titubantem.* So *Sall. Homines adoleſcentes ſummam poteſtatem nacti.* So *Ter. Ad. Piſces ex ſea entiâ nactus ſum. Rhenius* ſaith it was anciently *nanctus ab antiquo nancio. Voſſius* ſhews that it was paſſively taken in the preterperfect or participle rather, of the preſent from *Hygin. Fab.* 1. *Occaſione nactâ.* So *Fab.* 8. So *Apul.* l. 7. *Nactâ libertate, veris initio, prati herbentis, roſas utique reperturus aliquas. Saturn.* l. 1. c. 39. *Rhen.* p. 217. *Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 6.

Apiſcor, quod Vetus eſt verbum aptus ſum] This verb as *Saturnius* ſaith, is *perrarum quidem, Latinum tamen*; quoting for the uſe of it ſeveral Authours out of *Nonius Marcellinus. Auſon. Popma* l. 1. *de Uſu Antiq. Locut.* c. 7. produceth diverſe paſſages for it. *Plaut. in Epid.*

(and ye may find it, though he cite it not, in *Act.* 5. sc. 2.) *Tace jis modò siae me hominem apiſci.* So it may be found in *Rudent. Prol.* v. 17. *Qui hic litem apiſci poſtulant perjurio. Siſenna Hiſtoriar.* 3. *Itaque poſtero die legatos Iguvium redeuntes apiſcitur. Lucret.* l. 1. v. 449. *Nec ratione animi quam quiſquam poſcit apiſci. Tacit. Annal.* 3. *Præbuit juveni materiam apiſcendi honoris.* lb. 6. *Nihil abnuentem, dum dominationis apiſceretur. Id. Hiſtoriar.* 4. *Intus ſumma apiſcendi libido. Id. Annal.* 5. *Junius Gallio cenſuerat, ut prætoriani, actis ſtipendiis, jus apiſcerentur in quatuordecim ordinibus ſedendi.* But the deſign of *Popma* in producing them is to ſhew, that the Ancients did caſt ſyllables out of the middle of words, and ſo to prove by ſo many inſtances, that *apiſcor* is put for *adipiſcor*. But ſure he did not then think of *indipiſcor*, read in *Plaut. Trin.* 2. 2. *Multum in cogitando dolorem indipiſcor*, and *Stich.* 4. 2. *ſenex quidem voluit, ſi poſſet indipiſci de cibo.* And *Rud.* 5. 2. *Largiter mercedis indipiſcor. Gell.* l. 1. c. 11. *Sed enim Achaos Homerus pugnam indipiſci ait, non fidicularum, tibiarumque concentu, ſed mentium animorumque conſtirans nitibundos. Id.* l. 17. c. 2. *Conabamur poſtea memoriæ vegetandæ gratiâ, indipiſci animo, ac recenſere quæ in libro ſcripta eſſent.* Elſe he would rather have thought *adipiſcor* compounded of *apiſcor* and *ad*, like *indipiſcor* of *apiſcor* and *in*, than that *apiſcor* was made of *adipiſcor* by a *Syncope* of *di* from the middle of it. Of the preterperfect *aptus eſt*, it may not be amiſs to give ſome examples. *Saturnius* cites one out of *Varro, Ea omnibus oſtendat, quæ bello aptus eſt. Plaut. Captiv.* 4. 1. hath, *Sine ſacris hæreditatem ſum aptus effertiſſimam. Voſſius* cites an *Epitaph* for *Plaut.* out of *Gell.* l. 1. c. 24. *Poſtquam eſt mortem aptus Plautus comœdia luget*: and improves *Alciat* for reading it *captus*. But in my Book it is thus, *Poſtquam morte datu'ſt Plautus.* He alſo quotes out of *Nonius Marcellin. Quod ego in acie crebro objectans vitam bellando aptu ſum.*

And

Unde adipiſcor adeptus] *Adipiſcor* is ordinary. *Cic. 1. Offic. Qui adipiſci veram gloriam volunt, juſtitiæ fungantur officiis.* Thence *adeptus* in *Tacit.* l. 5. cited by *Saturnius, Servius Galba rerum adeptus eſt*, i. e. *potitus*. So *Cic. pro Clu. Summos a populo Romano honores eſt adeptus. Colum.* l. 5. c. 6. *Quum deinde arbor vetuſtatem fuerit adepta.* This verb hath anciently ſignified paſſively. Thence *Plaut. in Trin.* 2. 2. *Non ætate, verum ingenio adipiſcitur ſententia.* So *C. Fannius* cited by *Priſcian* l. 8. *Hæc adipiſcuntur*, i. e. συντυγχάνουσι. & *Fab. Max. amitti magis, quàm adipiſci. Gell.* l. 18. cited by *Saturn. Nomine non adepto jam, ſed cum ſpe mox adipiſcendi. Sall Jug. Prope jam adeptam victoriam retinere cupit. Boeth.* l. 3. *de Conſol.* c. 2. *Id autem eſt bonum, quo adepto, nihil ulterius deſiderari queat. Cic.* cited by *Pareus* in his *Lexic. Plaut. Adipiſcendi magiſtratus ſunt.* And no marvel, being there have been verbs in *o*, from whence theſe in *or* are formed. One I have now before my eye in *Plaut. Aſin.* 2. 2. v. 13. *Nunquam adepol quadrigis albis indipiſcet poſtea.* And *Stephanus* cites another from *Plaut. Aul.* 4. 10. *Neque partem tibi Ab eo, cui eſt, indipiſces* But my Book reads it, *Ab eo, quiqui eſt inde poſces. Alvar.* p. 254 *Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 6. & 25 *Rhen.* p. 216. *Saturn.* l. 6. c. 6. *Pomæ de uſu Antiq. Locut.* l. 1. c. 7.

Expergiſcor ſum experrectus] This verb is from the old *expergor*, and ſometimes it hath *experrectus*, and ſometimes *expergitus*: betwixt which two *Diomedes* makes this diſtinction, that *experrectus* notes one *watched* out of his ſleep by another. Hence *Salluſt. Interdum ſomno experrectus, arreptis armis, tumultum facere.* But *expergitus* notes one ſatisfied with ſleep, and *awaking* of himſelf. Hence *Lucil. Ergo è ſomno pueros cum mane expergitus clamo.* I ſuppoſe this latter too old to be uſed.

Et hæc quoque comminiſcor commentus] From *meno*, (whence *memini* and *mentio*) comes *meniſcor*, and thence *comminiſcor*, and ſo *reminiſcor*, ſaith *Voſſius*. *Commentus* is in *Plaut. Trin.* Sc. ult. v. 24 *Megaronides*

communis hoc meus & tuus Benevolens commentu'st. Truc. 1. 1. *Eo nunc commenta est dolum.* It is needless to shew other tenses of it to be taken *actively*. That else of *Plaut Asin.* 1. 1 *Fabricare quidvis, quidvis comminiscere*, would do it. It hath been attempted to be proved to have also had the *passive* signification; and 'tis probable: Yet not so much by that of *Appius Cæcus*, cited from *Priscian* by *Vossius*; *Amicum cum vides obliviscere miserias. inimicus si es commentus nec libens æquæ* (which I understand not) as by that of *Plaut. Truc* 2. 5. *Ædepol. commentum male.* Which *Pareus* quotes as an instance, that *commentum* signifies *confictum*, and is taken παθετικῶς. *Lexic Plaut.* To which purpose he cites also that of *Plaut. Cistel.* 2 1. *Credo ego amorem primùm apud homines carnificinam commentum.* And if it have it, no wonder, when there may be read *comminisco* in Active in *Appul. Met.* 4. quoted by both *Popma* and *Vossius*, *Medium* (or as *Beroaldus* reads it, *remedium*) *e re natâ validum, eo volente comminiscimus. Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 6. and 39. *Popma de usu Antiq. Locut.* l. 1. c. 11.

Nascor natus] From *Cato de* r. r. *Auson. Popma* brings in an instance, that *nasco* in the active form was anciently said. *Ubi germen nascere cœperit.* Thence was *nascitum*, and as from thence *nasciturus*, which *Portius Latro* in his declamation used. *Famam verò popularem a majoribus nostris sæpe numero accepimus, neque temere unquam nascituram esse, neque temere occasuram.* Thence the sacred Writers got it into use. But it is so rare, that *Phocas* said *nascor* had no such Participle belonging to it, as *Alvarus* notes. Yea saith *Saturnius*, *Nasciturus participium antiquis illis visum fuit adeo fugiendum, ut loco ejus nonnulli uti potius voluerint nascendus. Cujusmodi A. Gell.* l. 3. *Ad homines quoque nascendos.* And *Rhenius* quotes *Varro* and *Silius* for the same, but names no place. This verb *Saturnius*, and that upon second thoughts, doth plainly assevere to have a *Passive* signification, and because wherever

nascor

nascor is used, we may in stead of it use *gignor*. As in *Cic.* 1. *Off.* *Quæ in terris gignuntur*, was said by *Cicero* for *nascuntur*. 'Tis the lesse to be wondred at, when we have seen before *nasco* an active. *Popma de usu Antiq. Locut.* l. 1. c. 11. *Voss. Etymolog.* p. 112. *Alvar.* p. 225. *Rhen.* p. 273. *Saturn. Merc. Maj.* l. 1. c. 41.

Moriorque mortuus] This verb anciently hath been of the fourth Conjugation. Hence in *Priscian* l. 9. *Ennius* 14. *Annal.* hath, *Nobis ostendat, si vivimus sive morimur.* And *Ter. Eun.* 3. 1. *Risu omnes qui aderant, emoriri. Plaut. Asin.* 1. 1. v. 108. *Moriri sese misere mavolet, Quàm non perfectum reddat, quod promiserit.* It looks somewhat like a passive in those passages which *Saturn.* cites out of *Cic. ad C. Cass. D. Syllam alii mortuum a latronibus, alii cruditate dicebant.* And *Lucan.* l. 10. *Quis nolit ab isto Ense mori.* But it is but like one: as *patior*, when it is said, *Mundus a se patitur*; or *calesco*, when it is said, *Anima calescit ab ipso spiritu*; or *occido*, when it is said, *Occidit a sorti, sic Dii voluistis, Achille.* *Mortuus* some will have a noun: but they are deceived, saith *Vossius*, in as much as it is not only declined with case, but together with the *thing* signifies *time*, as in that of *Cic.* before mentioned, *D. Syllam*, &c. The participle of the future in *rus moriturus*, used in *Virgil*, *Quo moriture ruis?* is formed as from the supine *moritum*, which yet is not to be found in any extant Authour, that I know of. *Saturn. Merc. Major.* l. 1. c. 40. *Voss. Anal.* l 4. c. 10. *Etymolog.* p. 124.

Atque orior quod præteritum facit ortus] This verb is one of those, that partake of the formations of diverse conjugations: and have some terminations of both the third and the fourth. *Oriri* of the fourth it hath alwaies, but never *ori* of the third. Again, *Orĕris, orĭtur, orĭmur*, it hath, if not alwaies, yet more usually, than the same persons of the Fourth. *Ovid. Met.* l. 10. *Tu quoties oreris viridique in cespite flores. Ovid.* 1. *Fast. Prospera luæ oritur.* As from *oritum* it hath *oriturus*. *Hor.* l. 2.

ep. 1. *Nil oriturum aliàs, nil ortum tale fatentes.* So *oritum* by a *Syncope* made *ortum* it hath *ortus*. Whence *Cic. pro Clu. Quum quædam in callibus (ut solet) controversia pastorum esset orta.* From this verb comes *oriundus*, by an *Antistæchon* for *oriendus* which though it hath the termination of a participle of the future tense, yet hath the signification of the preterperfect tense, not an end, if not alwaies. *Plaut. Pœn.* 5. 2. *Nam haud repudio hospitium, neque Carthaginem, Inde sum oriundus. Plin.* (or *Suet.*) *de viris Illustribus.* c. 35. *Pyrrhus rex Epirotarum materno genere ab Achille, paterno ab Hercule oriundus.* Hither may be referred *adorior* compounded of *orior*, as that which somewhat follows the simple verb. Hence as *Sall. in Jug. Ne quo seditio aut bellum oriretur, anxius erat*; So *Liv.* l. 1. *ab urbe Timor infesit, ne vis aliqua externa civitatem adoriretur. Lucil.* l. 3. in *Priscian. Conturbare animam potis est quicunque adoritur.* So *Lucret.* l. 3. *Commutare animam quicunque adoritur & infit.* And as *Ovid.* 4. *Fast.* saith, *Sylvis fuit ortus in altis*: So *Ter. Ad.* 3. 3. *Adortus jurgio fratrem.* This participle *Vossius* from *Priscian* l. 8. cites *Aurelius* using passively, *Ab his Gallos adortos, ex insidiis plurimos necatos.* The participle in *dus*, is *adoriendus*, not *adoriundus*, that I can find. *Cic. ad Heren. Occasio queritur, Idoneane satis fuerit ad rem adoriendam, an alia melior. Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 6. and 35.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

The declining of the words. *An.* The words of this Rule are declined thus:

Labor, ĕris vel ĕre, lapsus sum vel fui, labi, lapsum.
Patior, ĕris vel ĕre, passus sum vel fui, pati, passum
[*Compatior, ĕris v. ĕre, compassus s.v. f. compati, compassum*]
Perpetior, ĕris vel ĕre, perpessus s. vel f. perpeti. perpessum
Fateor, ēris vel ēre, fassus s. vel f. fateri, fassum.
Confiteor, ĕris, vel ē e, confessus s. vel f. confiteri, confessum.
Diffiteor, ēris vel ēre diffessus s. vel f. diffiteri, diffessum.
Gradior, ĕris vel ĕre, gressus, &c. gradi, gressum.
Digredior, ĕris vel ĕre, digressus, &c. digredi, digressum.

Fatiscor,

Fatiſcor, ĕris vel ĕre, [*feſſus*, &c.] *fatiſci*, [*feſſū*]
Metior, īris, &c. *menſus*, &c. *metiri*, *menſum*,
uor, *uteris*, &c. *uſus*, &c. *uti*, *uſum*,
Ordior, *ordiris*, &c. *orſus*, &c. *ordiri*, *orſum*,
Nitor, ĕris, &c. *niſus & nixus*, &c. *niti*, *niſum & nixum*
Ulciſcor, ĕris, &c. *ultus*, &c. *ulciſci*, *ultum*,
Iraſcor, ĕris, &c. *iratus*, &c. *iraſci*, *iratum*,
Reor, *reris*, &c. *ratus*, &c. *reri*, *ratum*,
Obliviſcor, ĕris, &c. *oblitus*, &c. *obliviſci*, *oblitum*,
Fruor, ĕris, &c. *fructus & fruitus* &c. *frui*, *fructū & fruitū*
Miſereor, ēris, &c. *miſertus*, &c. *miſereri*, *miſertum*,
Tuor, tuĕris, &c. *tuitus ſum*, &c. [*tui*] *tutum*,
Tutor, tuēris, &c. *tuitus*, &c. *tueri*, *tuitum*,
Loquor, ĕris, &c. *locutus*, &c. *loqui*, *locutum*,
Sequor, eris, &c. *ſecutus*, &c. *ſequi*, *ſecutum*,
Experior, īris, &c. *expertus*, &c. *experiri*, *expertum*,
Paciſcor, ĕris, &c. *pactus*, &c. *paciſci*, *pactum*,
Nanciſcor, ĕris, &c. *nactus*, &c. *nanciſci*, *nactum*,
[*Apiſcor*, ĕris, &c. *aptus*, &c. *apiſci*, *aptum*,]
Adipiſcor, ĕris, &c. *adeptus*, &c. *adipiſci*, *adeptum*,
Queror, ĕris, &c. *queſtus*, &c. *queri*, *queſtum*,
Proficiſcor, ĕris, &c. *profectus*, &c. *proficiſci*, *profectum*
Expergiſcor, eris, &c. { *experrectus* [*expergitus*] } *expergiſci*, *experrectum*,
Comminiſcor, ĕris, &c. *commentus*, &c. *comminiſci*, *commentum*
Naſcor, ĕris, &c. *natus*, &c. *naſci*, *natum*,
Morior, ĕris, &c. *mortuus*, &c. *mori*,
Orior, { *oreris* / *oriris* } &c. { *ortus* } &c. *oriri*, *ortum*.

Qu. **May there any other verbs be added hither?**

An. Of *regular* verbs there may be added many of all conjugations: but of *irregular* ones, not many, yet ſome: as *divertor*, *prævertor*, *revertor*, which have *diverti*, *prævertī*, and *reverti* in their preterperfect tenſe; *aſſector* which hath *aſſectus ſum*; and *potior* which hath *potitus*

potitus sum, and is found used sometimes as a verb of the *Third* conjugation, and sometimes as of the *Fourth*.

¶ Of *Potior* used as a verb of the *third* conjugation these instances there are. *Virg.* 3. *An. Polydorum obtruncat, & auro Vi potitur. Ovid.* 3. *Fast. Mars videt hanc, visamque cupit, potiturque cupitâ. Ovid. Met.* 13. v. 130. *Tuque tuis armis, nos te poteremur Achille.* And so of its use as a verb of the *fourth* conjugation, these instances there are cited by *Vossius* from *Lucil. Deficit alma Ceres, nec plebes pane potitur*, and from *Nævius* or *Lævius* l. 2. *Iliad. Fecundo penetrat penitus, thalamoque potitur. Gell.* l. 9. *Macedones gentium, nationumque multarum potiri cœperant. Plaut Rud.* 1. 3. *Nam hoc mihi haud labore est laborem hunc potiri. Cic. de Finib. Cleanthes solem dominari, & rerum potiri putat. Id. Ep. Si exploratum tibi sit, posse te illius regni potiri.* Yea saith *Vossius*, in *infinitivo semper est quarta*. That this verb is taken *passively* sometimes, is the opinion of great Criticks. *Potiri hostium mira phrasi dicitur* saith *Pareus* in his *Lex. Plautin.* citing *Plaut. Epid.* a. 4 Sc. 1. *Gnata mea hostium potita est.* ib. v. 35. *Mu. Filiam quam ex te suscepi. Pe. Quid eam? Mu. Ductam perdidi, Hostium est potita. Id. Capt.* 1. 1. v. 24 *Nam postquam meus rex est potitus hostium.* That of *Ter. in Phor.* 3. 1 v. 5. *Ne quid propter tuam fidem decepta pateretur quid mali*, was anciently *potcretur*, as *Donatus* saith; and *Janus Gulielmius* calls them miserable Criticks (*nælli miseri critici sunt &c.*) who could not follow so good an Authour. By the phrase *potiri mali*, as *Pareus* expounds it, is meant *opprimi a malo, & in ejus tanquam potestatem venire.* In this sense *Cic.* 1. *Tusc.* puts *potitur fatorum* for *moritur*. Hence *Tryphonius* l. *de bello, Tit. de Captivis & postliminio reversis. Cætera quæ in jure sunt, postea quam postliminio redit, proco habentur, ac si nunquam iste hostium potitus fuisset.* And *Papinian. Exinde sui juris videtur fuisse, ex quo pater hostium potitus est.* See *Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 6. and 35. *Pareni Lex. Plaut. voce Potiri. Schrevil.*

in

in *Ter. Phorm.* 3. 1. *Saturn. Merc. Major.* l. 1. c. 37.

And thus far of the Rules for the preterperfect tenses and supines of Regular Verbs.

CHAP. XII.

Qu. WE have done with the *Regular* verbs, and are now come to the *Irregulares*, **Tell me, how many sorts of them there be?**

An. Of irregular verbs there be three sorts, *Redundants, Variants, Defectives.*

Qu. **What is the Rule for the Redundant Verbs?**

An. For the verbs that are Redundant there is this Rule.

De verbis geminum præteritum habentibus viz. Activæ & Passivæ vocis.

Præteritum activæ & passivæ vocis habent hæc, Cæno cænavi & cænatus sum tibi format; juro, juravi & juratus, &c. *Præteritum activæ & passivæ vocis*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is, this: That there be some verbs, which have two preterperfect tenses, the one of the Active, and the other of the passive form: as *placeo placui placitus; nubo nupsi nupta sum; libet libuit libitum; licet licuit licitum; tædet pertæduit pertæsum; pudet puduit puditum*; and *piget piguit pigitum.*

¶ *Præteritum activæ & passivæ vocis*] By *passive voice* we are to understand sometimes only the *passive form*, and not alwaies the passive *signification*: for though the *signification* be much according to the *form*, yet sometime the *signification* is *active*, when the *form* is *passive*.

Cæno

Cæno cænavi & cænatus sum tibi format] *Cænavi* in *Cic. Qu. Fr.* l. 2, ep. 8. *Eo die cænavi apud Crassipedem. Id. in Vatin. Quis in funere familiari cænavit cum togâ pullâ. Cænatus* is in *Cic. de Invent. Cænati discubuerunt ibidem.* But *Cænavi* and *cænatus sum* are not in every point the same. For we may not say *cænatus sum apud te*, but *cænavi* only: at *Plaut. Amph.* 2. 2. *Mecum cænavisti. Cænatus* (as *Vossius* and *Alvarus* say) hath place, when we say what one did, or had done to him, when, or after that he had supped. *Cic.* 1. *de Divin. Qui cum cænati quiescerent. Cic. pro Deiot. Quum illa munera inspexisset cænatus. Horat.* 1. *Serm.* 10. *Satyr. Amet scripsisse ducentos Ante cibum versus totidem cænatus. Sall. in Jugurth. Consilium adprobat, ac statim milites cænatos esse in castris, igneſque creberrimos fieri. Cic. Att.* l. 2, ep. 16. *Cænato mihi & jam dormitanti epistola illa reddita est.* And perhaps whilst he supped. As in that of *Cornel. Nepos in vita Attici. Neque unquam sine aliquâ lectione apud eum cænatum est. Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 21. *Alvar.* pag. 236, 237.

Juravi & juratus] *Juratus sum* seems used sometimes for *juravi. Plaut. Curc.* 4. 4. *Quod fui juratus feci*, ib. 2. 3. v. 88. *Quid quod juratus sum? Id. Persa* 3. 2. *Qui mihi juratus est sese hodie argentum dare. Gell.* 7. 18. *Statimque ut juraverant ad Annibalem profecti sunt. Plaut. Rud.* 5. 2. v. 16, 17. *Non tu juratus mihi es? Juratus sum, & nunc jurabo.* Yet *juratus sum* is not the preterperfect of *juro*, but of *juror*, read in *Lucan. & Stat.* observed, not by *Vossius* alone, as himself acknowledgeth. *De Analog.* l. 3. c. 21. *Joan. Tiffin. Comment. in Ciceron. pro Cecin.* p. 175.

Potoque potavi & potus] *Potavi* is alwaies taken *actively*: *potus* sometimes, if we will believe *Rhenius*. But no example of it have we in him, or any else, that I find: and therefore I conclude it taken alwaies either *Passively*, or *Neutrally*. *Passively* as in *Ovid.* 1. *Fastor. Quo plus sunt potæ, plus fitiuntur aquæ. Id. Met.* 15. *Nocte nocent potæ, sine vexâ luse bibuntur.*

Cic. de Clar. Orator. Sanguine tauri poto mortuus concidit Themiſtocles. Neutrally in theſe *Cic. pro Mil. Adde inſcitiam pranſi, poti, oſcitantis ducis. Ovid. 3. Faſtor. Tenem potum poca trahebat anus. Cic. Fam.* l. 7. ep. 32. *Etſi domum bene potus ſeroque redieram, tamen—* And ſo *Saturnius* ſaith of the two former, *Quæ ego potius abſoluta exiſtimaverim, quam tranſitiva.* In a word, of whomſoever it may be ſaid *potus eſt*, of him it may be ſaid *potavit*: but whether of whomſoever it may be ſaid *potavit*, of him it may be ſaid *potus eſt*; let the ſober Reader judge. If not, then is not *potus ſum* the preterperfect of *poto Rhen.* p. 269. *Saturn.* l. 6. c. 5. *Voſſ. Analog.* l. 3. c. 21. *Alvar.* p. 236, 237.

Titubo titubavi vel titubatus] *Titubavi* is alwaies uſed *activelv*: but *Titubatus* either *paſſivelv*, as *Cic.* 3. *de Orat. Verſus debilitatur in quacunque ejus ſit parte titubatum. Id in ep. Si quid forte titubatum eſt, ut in bello. Id. Si tantulum offenſum titubatumque ſit.* Or *Neutrally*, as *Virg.* 5. *Æn. Hic juvenis jam victor ovans veſtigia preſſo Haud tenuit titubata ſolo*, i. e. *quæ titubaverant.*

Sic careo carui & caſſus ſum] *Caſſus* is a noun, and not a participle: nor will it be eaſie to find where any one ſaid *caſſus ſum* for *carui*. So that till Authority be produced for it, the continuance of this in his Grammar ſeems to be a miſtake in the learned *Jaſp. Berengi*. See before *Carui, caſſum, caritumque.*

Prandeo, prandi, & pranſus] *Pranſus* is not the ſame that *prandi*: but ſignifies *qui prandit, vel confectio prandio, vel a prandio*, as *Alvarus, Farnaby* and *Nonius Marcellinus* think: and like *cænatus*, hath place, when we declare what one doth, or ſuffereth, or how one is affected, after that he hath dined; as *Cic. pro Mil. Vide inſcitiam pranſi, poti oſcitantis ducis.* Nor as *Plaut.* ſaid in *Pœn. Calidum prandium prandiſti*, would any one ſay *Calidum prandium pranſus es.* Nor would *Voſſius* ſay *pranſus ſum apud te*; but *prandi*: and again

Pran-

pransus ad te accedam. See before *Cœno & poto*. And *Alvar*. p. 236, 237, 239. *Voss de Analog*. l. 3. c. 21.

Pateo patui & passus] But we have shewed before, that *passum* is not from *pateo*, but from *pando*: and *passus sum* is the preterperfect of *pandor*, not of *pateo*. If *Jasz Berengi*, who espouses this, shall give us his Authour for it, he will then give us cause to free both himself, and our *Authour* from imputation of mistake.

Placeoque dat placui & placitus] *Placui* and *placitus sum* are very near, if not all out, the same in sense. *Ter. Hecyr. Prol. ubi sunt cognitæ, placitæ sunt*. i. e. *placuerunt*. *A. Gell*. l. 1. cited by *Saturn*. l. 1. c. 27. *Et statim displicita est insolentia*, *Ovid*. *Non ita diu placuit*. *Plaut*. *Amph*. *Ita diis placitum*. *Quintil*. *Pueros adulescentibus sedere permixtos non placet mihi*. So *Saturnius* cites it from him. *Hor*. l. 2. *Od*. 17. *Sed potenti justitiæ placitumque Parcis*. But yet *placitus sum* can hardly be said to be the preterperfect tense of *placeo*, if such a word as *placeor* be read. And such a word *Saturnius* quotes from St. *Cyprian*, who in his *Ep*. said, *Si hominibus placetur*, *dominus offenditur*; Suitable to what *Seneca* said, *Ab his nihil divinitus nocetur*. Notwithstanding because this word is, as *Saturnius* saith, *perinde rarum*, *ut nusquam alibi reperiatur*, if it shall not be allowed of (so willing am I to find no more faults in our Authour, or any else, than needs must be) let *placitus sum* go for a preterperfect tense of *placeo*, if it please you. And however with *Vossius* and *Saturnius*, let the Impersonal *placet* have *placuit*, and *placitum est*; which perhaps is that, and all that our Authour here meant. *Saturn*. l. 3. c. 14.

Suesco suevi atque suetus] *Suevi* and *suetus* may agree much in sense and use, but neither of them is from *sueso*. But *suevi* is from *sueo*, used by *Lucret*. l. 1. *Et femina rerum Appellare sucmus*; i. e. *solemus*. *Ib*. *Nec frigora quimus Usurpare oculis, nec voces emittere*

vere ſuemus. And thence *ſueſco* borrows the preterperfect *ſuevi.* And *ſuetus ſum* is, if not from *ſueor*, no ſuch word being read, yet from *ſueſcor*, whereof in *Liv.* l. 2. is read *aſſueſcor. Charitaſque ipſius ſoli, eum longo tempore aſſueſcitur, animos eorum conſociáſſet.* Whence I ſuppoſe the *Gryphiſw. Grammar* hath not *ſueſco*, but *aſſueſco, aſſuevi* and *aſſuetus ſum.* p. 53.

Veneo pro vendor, venivi venditus & ſum] *Venivi*, or rather *venii* (as Grammarians love to ſpeak) and *venditus ſum* may in ſenſe agree, yet they are preterperfect tenſes of two ſeveral verbs, *venivi* or *venii* of *veneo*, and *venditus ſum* of *vendor.* And I cannot underſtand why *Jaſz Berengi* or any other ſhould give to a verb a preterperfect tenſe more than it needs, or hath.

Nubo nupſi nuptaque ſum] *Nuptus ſum* I find not read in any Authour, but *nupta ſum*, nor ſcarce in any Grammarian, but *Saturnius* and *Jaſz Berengi*, thence I ſuppoſe our Authour changes the gender of the participle. But in ſenſe I ſee no difference between *nupſi* and *nupta ſum. Cic.* 1. *Divin. Virgo nupſit illi, cui Cæcilia nupta fuerat. Cic. pro Cluent. Quæ brevi tempore poſt patris mortem A. Aurio Melino conſobrino ſuo nupſit. Plaut. Amph.* 2. 2 *Quid ego deliqui, ſi cui nupta ſum, tecum fui. Cic. Fam.* 15. 3. *Quocum eſſet nupta regis Armeniorum ſoror. Id.* l. 2. *de Orat. quo cùm* (if *Saturnius* quote it right) *nupta erat matertera noſtra. Plaut. Trin.* 1. 2. *Dum quidem hercle tecum nupta ſit, janè velim. A. Gell.* l. 1. *Ut una apud duos nupta eſſet. Cic. pro Cæl. Cum ex ampliſſimo genere in familiam clariſſimam nupſiſſes. Tacit.* l. 1. *Julia denupſit in domum Rubellii.* But this verb is uſed not of *women* only, but of *men* too, yet womaniſh men moſt an end, if not alwaies. *Martial.* l. 12. *Barbatus rigido nupſit Calliſtratus Afro. Hâc quâ legevivo nubere virgo ſolet. Id.* l. 8. ep. 12. *Uxori nubere nolo meæ. Juven. Sat.* 2. *Quid quæris? nubit amicus, Pomponius Pannuceatis in Nonius, ſed meus major*

frater

frater nupſit dotatæ vetulæ. Hence *Chalinus* in *Plaut. Caſin.* 5. 1. is called *nuptus. Lubet Chalinum, quid agat ſcire, novum nuptum cum novo marito.* And when it is that a *man* is married to a *man* which is againſt nature, it may not be unfit to ſay of that man, *nuptus eſt*, though that be againſt uſe; which perhaps thoſe two very learned Grammarians above-mentioned had reſpect unto. Yet is not *nuptus* or *nupta ſum* the preterperfect of *nubo*, but of *nubor*: which is read in *Plaut. Perſ.* 3. 1. *Non tu nunc hominum mores vides. Quojuſmodi hic cum famâ facile nubitur? Dum dos ſit, nullum vitium vitio vertitur.* If that may not be allowed of, then we may ſay with *Voſſius* too as well as our Authour, *Nubo facit nupſi, & nupta ſum. Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 25. *Saturn. Merc. Maj.* l. 1. c. 27. *Rhen.* p. 269. *Alvar.* p. 244.

Mereor meritus ſum vel merui] *Meritus ſum* and *merui* may agree in ſenſe: but as *meritus ſum* is of *mereor*, ſo *merui* is of *mereo*: for that verb is read in *Plaut. Menæch.* 2. 3. *Item huic ultro fit, ut meret, potiſſimum noſtræ domi ut ſit. Ib.* 5. 7. *Adibo, atque hominem accipiam, quibus dictis mereat. Id. Moſtell.* 1. 1. *Quia nunquam merui, tu meruiſti, & nunc meres.* So in *Plaut. Pſeud.* 4. 7. is read *demereo*: *Quid mercedis petaſus hodie domino demeret? A. Gell.* l. 1. c. 8. *Grandem pecuniam demerebat. Suet. in Aug. Avunculum magnopere demeruit.* i. e. *devinxit*, ſaith *Saturnius*. So *Promereo* is in *Plaut. Trin.* 3. 2. *Nam retineri nequeo, quin dicam ea, quæ promeres. Ter. And.* 2. 1 *Neutiquam officium liberi eſſe hominis puto, cum is nihil promereat, poſtulare id gratiæ apponi ſibi.*

Adde libet, libuit, libitum] So *Saturnius*. l. 3. c. 23. and *Voſſius Etymolog.* p. 137. and *Alvar.* p. 242. *Libuit* is read in *Ter. Eun.* 4. 7. as *Stephanus* quotes it, and *Farnaby* reads it. *Et cum eo clam ſubdixiſti te mihi? Libuit, Schrevelius* reads it *lubuit*. So in *Plaut. Pſeud.* 1. 3. *Cur id auſus facere? Libuit, mea fuit.* So *Stephanus*

reads

reads it: *Plantin, lubuit. Libitum eſt* is neer the ſame in ſenſe with it. *Ter. Ad.* 5. 1. *Prodeambulare huc libitum eſt. Plaut. Curc* 5. 2. *Quid iſtum tibi tactio eſt? Quia mihi libitum eſt. Plaut. Bacch.* 5. 1. *Is me ſcelus uſque attondit dolis doctis, indoctum ut libitum eſt.* Where *libitum eſt* hath the perfect ſenſe of the preter-perfect tenſe. *Plaut. Mil.* 3. 2. *Qui libitum eſt illi condormiſcere? Cic.* 2. *de Leg. Quoniam libitum eſt vobis me ad hæc impellere.*

Et licet adde quod licuit licitum] *Quintil.* l. 4. c. 4. hath *licuit. Procuratorem tibi eſſe non licuit. Cic. pro Flac. Hanc te capere non licuit. Cic. Att.* l. 2. *Nihilo magis ei liciturum eſſet plebeio remp. perdere quam ſimilibus ejus me conſule patriciis licitum eſſet. Id. in Fam. Quibus ſine dolore licitum eſt mortem cum vitâ commutare. Id. Antiq. in Exil. Dum in civitate manere licitum eſt.* So that here alſo we may ſay with *Voſſius, Saturnius*, and *Alvarus*, as well as our own Authour, *Alicet venire lituit, & licitum eſt ſatis conſtat.* One thing by the way I obſerve, that *eſt* is more uſed with *licitum*, and *libitum*, than *fuit. Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 22. *Saturn.* l. 3. c. 23.

Tædet quod tæduit & dat pertæſum] So *Voſſius* in his *Etymolog.* p. 137. as well as our Authour. *Tædet* is in *Cic. Att.* l. 5. *Tædet omnes nos vitæ Ter. Eun.* 1. [illegible] *tædet, & amore ardeo. Id. Phorm.* 3. 2. *At enim tædet jam audire eadem millies. Plaut. Caſin.* 1. 1. *Tædet ſermonis tui. Tædebat* is in *Ter. Ad.* 1. 1. *Credo jam omnium tædebat. Tædeat in Cic.* 2. *Verr. ſunt homines quos libidinis & infamiæ ſuæ neque pudeat, neque tædeat. Pertæſum eſt in Virg. Æn.* 5. —*Et quos Pertæſum magni incepti rerumque tuarum eſt. Id. Æn.* 4 *Si non pertæſum thalami tædæque fuiſſet. Plaut. Moſtell.* 1. 4. *Ita me ibi male convivii ſermoniſque pertæſum eſt.* But this *tæduit* I cannot find. Hence I ſuppoſe both *Rhenius* and *Saturnius*, and *Hayn* decline this verb *tædet* only with *pertæſum eſt.* And ſo *Alvarus*: *tantum tædet vel potius pertædet pertæſum eſt.* And yet *Saturnius* from

pertædeo cites *pertæduissent* out of *A. Gell.* l. 1. *Verbi ejus defatigati pertæduissent.* Thence doubtless Mr *Farnaby* instead of *tædet* hath *pertædet, pertæduit & pertæsum est.* And so *Linacer. & a tædet, vel potius pertædet pertæsum est.* He had said that some (and he names this amongst the rest) had a double preterperfect tense given to them; therefore giving this for one, he allows *tæduit* or rather *pertæduit* for the other. If therefore we shall allow our Authour (and why may we not?) to set down *tæduit* by an *Aphæresis* for *pertæduit*, he may be as right as the best; *tæduit* the simple being no more in use, than *tæsum*, for which we use the compound *pertæsum*, and so may *pertæduit*, for ought I know. *Jasx-Berengi* hath *tæditum est*: but I know no Authour for that. *Voss. Etymolog.* p. 137 *Farnab.* p. 37. *Linacer de Emendat. Structi* l. 4. p. 179. *Saturn.* l. 4. c. 25. *Hayne* p. 76 *Rhen.* p. 258. *Alvar.* p. 242.

Adde pudet faciens puduit puditumque] So *Farnaby*, and *Vossius*, *Rhenius*, and *Alvarus*. *Puduit* is in *Sil.* l. 10. *Mens abiit, puduitque fugæ. Puditum est in Plaut. Bacch.* 3. 1. *Neque mei, neque te tui istatus puditum est factis, quæ facis. Appul. in Apolog. Nonne vos puditum est hæc crimina tali viro objectare? Cic. pro [illegible] Nonne esset puditum, si hanc causam ageret [illegible]e. Plaut. Casin.* 5. 2. v. 4. *Pudet quod prius non puditum unquam est.* Indeed *Saturnius* saith, *Jam verò pigitum est, & puditum est, pro piguit & puduit, jam quis inter verba recepit?* l. 3. *Metr. Maj.* c. 25.

Atque piget tibi quod formas piguit, pigitumque] So *Farnaby*, *Vossius*, *Rhenius*, *Alvarus*. *Piguit* seems no ordinary word. *Stephanus* cites *Columella* l. 6. c. 1. for it. *Cæterum de tam sapiente viro pigiit dicere.* But in the Authour, at least in my Book, it is, and as it seems should be, *piget*. But indeed *Cic. contr. Sall.* (if that be *Cicero's*) it is read. *Neque piguit quærere, cur ego P. Crassi domum emissem. Pigitum* is in *Sill.* l. 7. *Nec pigitum est parvos.*

parvoſque lares humiliſque ſubire. Limina cœlicolam tetĭi. So *Gell.* l. 13. cited by *Saturnius*, *Pigitum eſt cinctos ſaltem eſſe & penulatos. Id.* 15. 13. *Veritum autem, ſicut puditum & pigitum, non perſonaliter per infinitum modum dictum eſſe non a vetuſtioribus tantum videmus. Farnab.* p. 37. *Alvar.* p. 242. *Voſſ. Etym.* p. 137. *Analog.* l. 4. c. 13. *Rhen.* p. 259. *Saturn. Merc. Maj.* c. 25.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus:

The declining of the words.

Cano, cænas, cœnavi, cœnare, cœnatum,
Juro, juras, juravi, jurare, juratum,
Poto, potas, potavi, potare, potatum & potum,
Titubo, titubas, titubavi, titubare, titubatum,
Careo, cares, carui, carere, caritum,
Prandeo, prandes, prandi, prandere, prandſum,
Placeo, places, placui & placitus ſum, placere, placitum,
Pateo, pates, patui, patere ———
Sueſco, ſueſcis, ſuevi, ſueſcere, ſuetum,
Veneo, venis, venii, venire,
Nubo, nubis, nupſi, [& nuptus ſum] nubere, nuptum,
Mereor, mereris, meritus ſum, mereri, meritum,
Mereo, meres, merui, merere, meritum,
Libet, libebat, libuit & libitum eſt, libere,
Licet, licebat, licuit & licitum eſt, licere,
Tædet, tædebat, pertæduit & pertæſum eſt, tædere,
Pudet, pudebat, puduit & puditum eſt, pudere,
Piget, pigebat, piguit & pigitum eſt, pigere.

Qu. **Are there any other words of like nature, that may be added hither?**

An. Of like nature to the words in this Rule ſome other words are accounted to be, which may be referred hither: as *punio punivi & punitus ſum; doleo dolui & dolitus ſum; cenſeo cenſui & cenſus ſum; queo quis quivi & quitus ſum; odio* (out of uſe) *odi & oſus ſum; deſino, deſivi & deſitus ſum.*

¶ The active preter-perfect tenſes of theſe verbs are

not doubted of: those of the passive form, though of Active signification follow. Of *punitus sum* we have an instance in *Cic. pro Mil. Cujus tu inimicissimum multo crudelius etiam punitus es, quàm erat humanitatis mea postulare. Punitus es*, i. e. *punivisti*, saith *Barthol. Latomus Schol. in loc.* This 'tis like *Quintillian* had in his Eye, when in his l. 9. c. 3. he set down that figure of speech, *Inimicos punitus es.* And no doubt but *Appul.* followed, in his l. 8. when he said, *Punita sum nefarium meorum nuptiarum prædonem.* Yet in strictness though *punitus sum* be used to signifie the same that *punii*, it is not a preterperfect of *punio*, and so *punio* (though *Vossius* himself give it, that *puuio etiam apud Tullium punii & punitus sum facit*) is no Redundant, but it is a preterperfect of *punior*, which in other tenses also, beside the preterperfect tense, was used Deponently in an active sense, as *Auson. Popma* l. 1. *de Antiq. Locut.* c. 11. sheweth. *Cic. Tusc.* 1. *Multi inimicos etiam mortuos puniuntur. Id. de Offic.* l. 1. *Neque ad ejus qui punitur alsquem, aut verbis castigat, sed ad reipublicæ utilitatem referri. Id. Phil.* 8. *Clarissimorum hominum crudelissimam punivetur necem.*

That *doleo* hath *dolui* and *dolitus sum* is *Saturnius* his observation: and he proves it three times over, p. 57. and 69. and 281. Yet all with *one proof* out of *A. Gell.* l. 9. c. 13. *Id subito perdolitum est cuidam Tito Manlio summo genere nato*— which are the words of *Claud. Quadrigarius* there related by *Gellius.*

That *censeo* hath *census sum* beside *censui* is thought because of that of *Ovid.* l. 1. *de Pont.* El. 3. *Hanc probat & primo dilectum semper ab ævo, Est inter comites martia census suos.* But if *censeor* have not been a Deponent, as *Stephanus* and his followers say, but supposed by *Vossius* to be mistaken, yet this like the other of *perdolitum est*, is but an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, no news of it elsewhere, that I hear of, but in *Cic. pro Flac.* where there is at least in the opinion of *Vossius*, a false crie of it, See *Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 5.

That

That *queo* makes not *quivi* only, but *quitus ſum* is thought, becauſe of that of *Gellius* l. 20. c. 1. *Sævitia iſta pœnæ contemni non quita eſt.* And that of *Ter. Hec.* 4. 1. v. 57. *Nam quum compreſta eſt gnata, forma in tenebris noſci non quita eſt.* But *Saturnius*, *Rhenius*, and *Voſſius* too, tell us that *queatur* is read in *Lucret.* l. 1. for *queat.* And ſo 'tis v. 1043. *Dum veniant aliæ ac ſupleri ſumma queatur.* And I am ſure in *Plaut. Perſ.* 2. 2. v. 12. is read *queantur. Nec ſubigi queantur unquam, ut pro eâ fide habeant judicem. Appul. in Apolog.* hath *nequitur. Sola virginitas, cum ſemel accepta eſt, reddi nequitur. Plaut. Rud.* 4. 4. v. 20. *Ut nequitur comprimi!* And then *quitus ſum* may ſignifie the ſame that *quivi*, but it will not be a Redundant preterperfect of *queo*, but the right preterperfect of *queor* uſed Deponently.

As there is *odi* by a *Syncope* put for *odivi* (uſed by *M. Anton.* in his letters recited in *Cicero's Philip.* 13.) of the obſolete verb *odio*, yet uſed by St. *Hicrome*, So there is *oſus ſum* alſo read in *active* ſignification. *Plaut. Amph.* 3. 2. 19. *Ita ingenium meum eſt, Inimicos ſemper oſa ſum obtuerier. Gell.* l. 4. c. 8. *Hunc Fabricius non probabat, neque amico utebatur, oſuſque eum morum cauſâ fuit.* And ſo the compounds of it *peroſus & exoſus. Sueton. Tib.* c. 21. *Si non Populus Romanus peroſi ſunt. Curt.* l. 8 *Patrios mores exoſus es.* So *Ovid. Met* 8. l. *Longumque peroſus Exilium. Id. ib.* l. 1. *Illa velut crimen tædas exoſa jugales. Liv.* l. 8. *ab Urbe. Plebs conſulum nomen, haut ſecus quàm regum, peroſa erat. Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 39. *Rhen.* p. 222.

Deſivi, and by *Syncope deſii* is ordinary: and in *Plaut.* as from *deſitus ſum*, is read *deſitum eſt. Moſtell.* 4. 2. *Nunquam hic triduum unum deſitum eſſe & bibi. Gram. Giphiſwald.* p. 53.

There are beſides theſe *Redundants* of other ſorts:

Firſt ſome have *two preterperfect* tenſes and both of the *active* form: as *conniveo connivi & connixi; parco peperci & parſi.*

Secondly, ſome *two Preterperfect* tenſes and both of

the *passive* form: as *niter nisus & nixus sum; fruor fructus & fruitus sum*, &c.

Thirdly, some are Redundant in their *supines* only; as *torqueo torsi tortum & torsum; indulgeo indulsi indultum & indulsum.*

Fourthly, Some are Redundant both in *Preterperfect* tense and *Supine*: as *forbeo forbui & forpsi* (according to vulgar account) *forbitum & forptum; mulgeo mulsi & mulxi, mulsum & mulctum*, &c.

But as these are reckoned up all together in their orders by Mr. *Bird* in his Grounds of Grammar. p. 91, 92. so they have been severally touched in these Notes, in passing along, and may be found in their respective places, and so need not here again to be repeated.

And thus far of Verbs *Redundant*: Our next proceeding must be unto those that are *Variant*.

CHAP XIII.

Qu. **Which do you call Variant Verbs?**

An. *Variant Verbs* are those which in their declining do *vary* from the common form of declining.

Qu. **How many sorts of such verbs are considered here in the Grammar?**

An. In the Grammar here are considered two sorts of Variant Verbs, First some that are declined with an Irregular preterperfect tense formed from *themselves*, Secondly some that are declined with an irregular preterperfect tense borrowed from some *other Verb.*

Qu. **What verbs are declined with an irregular preterperfect formed from** themselves?

An. With an irregular preterperfect formed from *themselves* are declined some *Neuter-passives.*

Qu. **Which is the Rule for those Neuter-passives?**

An.

An. The Rule for thoſe Neuter-paſſives is this:

De Neutro-paſſivorum præteritis.

Neutro-paſſivum ſic præteritum tibi format,
Gaudeo gaviſus ſum; fido fiſus & audeo
Auſus ſum, fio factus, ſolco ſolitus ſum,
Mœreo ſum mœſtus; ſed Phœce nomen habetur.

Neutro-paſſivum ſic præteritum.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That ſome *Neuter-paſſives* are declined with a preterperfect tenſe of the *Paſſive* form; as *gaudeo gaviſus ſum; fido fiſus ſum; audeo auſus ſum; ſolco ſolitus ſum.*

¶ *Neutro-paſſivum*] Verbs neuters though they neither be paſſives, becauſe they end in *o* like Actives; nor be Actives, becauſe they cannot take *r*, and become Paſſives, yet do many times partake with both the Active and the Paſſive, whence thoſe diſtinctions of them into *Neuter-active*, and *Neuter-paſſive*, A *Neuter-active* is a verb, that is partly active, and partly neuter: *Active*, in that it hath an active ſignification and conſtruction: *Neuter* in that it ends only in *o*, and cannot take *r*, and become a paſſive, as *ambio, convenio, facio, &c.* A *Neuter-paſſive* is a verb that is partly Neuter and partly Paſſive: *Neuter* in that it cannot take *r* and become a Paſſive; and *Paſſive* in that it either hath a paſſive ſignification and conſtruction, as *vapulo, veneo, liceo, exulo*; or elſe a *Preterperfect tenſe of the Paſſive form* and termination, as *gaudeo gaviſus, fido fiſus, audeo auſus, ſolco ſolitus*; or thirdly both, the paſſive ſignification and conſtruction throughout the whole, and the paſſive form and termination in the preterperfect tenſe, as *fio factus ſum.* And this accurateneſs of diſtinction I ſee obſerved by that rational and methodical Writer Mr. *Bird* School-maſter of *Glocester*, but by none elſe. *Scaliger* in his 5. l. *de cauſſ. Ling. Lat.* c. 100. gives us this account of theſe *minutiores antiquorum ſectiones*, as he calls thoſe ſubdiviſions of verbs made by the Ancients. *Inter Neutra* (ſaith he) *ſtatu-*

ère Neutropaſſivum: ut exulo, vapulo: ac Neutra quidem, quoniam ex ſeſe Paſſivum non crearent: Paſſiva autem, quia ſignificatio recideret in eum de quo verbum dicebatur. Igitur ab accidente, hoc eſt a voce Neutra formâ, hoc eſt a ſignificatione Paſſiva dicta ſunt. But this diſcription is too narrow, reaching only unto the firſt branch of our diſtinction, ſo that *vapulo, veneo, &c.* ſhall only be *Neuter-paſſives*, but not *gaudeo, audeo*, and the reſt of that ſort; becauſe they do not ſignifie paſſively. *Sebaſtian Duisburgenſis* in his Notes on *Deſpauterius* defines a *Neuter-paſſive* thus: *Verbum neutro-paſſivum eſt, quod deſinens in o, facit præteritum ac ſi deſineret in or, ut ſoleo ſolitus ſum, &c.* And ſo the *Grammar of Gryphiſwald. Quædam verba dicuntur Neutro-paſſiva, quæ cum in o deſinant, præterita tamen more paſſivorum faciunt: ut audeo auſus ſum, &c.* But this deſcription alſo is too narrow, for it takes not in *exulo, vapulo, &c.* which have the paſſive ſignification, though they be not declined in any reſpect like paſſives; and therefore not only by *Scaliger*, and the Ancients before, but by our own *Grammar* alſo afterward, in the *Syntaxis*, where it treats of the conſtruction of paſſives, are called *Neuter-paſſives*; *vapulo, veneo, liceo, &c. Neutro-paſſiva paſſivam conſtructionem habent.* So the *Rule* there however here, by the examples our Authour ſeems to look upon thoſe only as *Neuter-paſſives* which have a preterperfect tenſe of the paſſive form and termination. To rectifie this miſtake Mr. *Hayne* in his Grammar reads this rule, not in the general, or indifinite way, as here, *Neutropaſſivum, &c.* but more particularly and reſtrainedly, *Neutro-paſſiva hæc ſic præteritum tibi formant, Gaudeo gaviſus ſum, &c.* Yet the meaning of *Duisburgenſis* and the *Gram. of Gryphiſw.* was not wholly to exclude thoſe of the firſt branch, *vapulo, veneo, &c.* for they bring them in under other terms of diſtinction, as unwilling to confouud thoſe under one denomination, betwixt which they ſaw there was a real diſtinction. The firſt calls them *Neutra-paſſiva. Verbum*

bum neutrum-paſſivum (ſaith he) *quod in o deſinens paſſivè ſignificat: ut ſex hic poſita, vapulo* i. e. *percutior, &c.* The ſecond calls them *Neutralia paſſiva, quæ licet deſinant in o, paſſive tamen ſignificant*; And ſo doth *Voſſius* too in the *Text* of his Grammar, though in his *Margine* he adds, *vel Neutro-paſſiva*, as intimating that they are called alſo *Neuter-paſſives*; yet adding that *Alias Neutro-paſſiva dicuntur, quæ præteritum formant more paſſivorum; ut audeo auſus ſum, &c.* Either term *Neutro-paſſiva* or *Neutra-paſſiva* will ſerve to take in all the members of our diſtinction, but neither of them do ſo diſtinctly note one member as to exclude the others, and become (as Mr. *Stockwood* in his Diſputations qu. 29. p. 206. makes them) ſubdividing terms, as if thoſe that are *Neutro-paſſiva* were not *Paſſiva-neutra, & vice verſâ*. In this methinks there may be a reconciliation if *Neutro-paſſiva* be allowed to comprehend alſo all that are *Neutra-paſſiva*, or *Neutralia-paſſiva* as ſome ſpeak, yet κατ' ἐξοχὴν to note thoſe more eſpecially, which form a paſſive preterperfect tenſe, as theſe in our Rule here do. Or again if *Neutra-paſſiva* be allowed to comprehend thoſe alſo that are termed *Neutro-paſſiva*, yet more eſpecially to note thoſe, which have the ſignification, but not the formation of a paſſive. If any man think otherwiſe, I will not preſcribe to his opinion or fancy. Only I ſeem not ſo well to reliſh that term *Neutralia-paſſiva*, becauſe that to me ſeems to ſignifie Paſſives that are Neuters, or taken Neutrally, of which ſort I know none diſtinct from Deponents ſignifying Neutrally, or Abſolutely, as *orior* I riſe, or *glorior* I boaſt, which if any man will call *Neutralia-paſſiva*, I ſhall not hinder him.

Gaudeo gaviſus ſum] From *gaviſum* comes *gaviſus*; and *gaviſum* comes from *gaviſi*, which formerly was in uſe; Hence *Caſſius Hemina* in *Priſcian.* l. 9. *Itaque admiratum eſſe gaviſi.* So *Liv.* (there alſo) *Quoniam audivi pauciſ, gaviſi.* Though *gaviſi* is now out of uſe.

Fido fiſus] *Fiſus* comes from *fiſum*, and *fiſum* from *fidi*,

fidi, once in uſe; whence *confidi* read in *Liv.* l. 4. *dec.* 5. *Agros confidunt ſe a populationibus tueri poſſe.*

Et audeo auſus] *Auſus* is from *auſum* (as alſo *auſurus* in *Sall. Jug. Nihil illum auſurum palam.* And *Auſon. Turpe quid auſurus te ſine teſte time*) and that from *auſi* ſometimes uſed: (whence *Cato pro Luc. Anton.* in *Priſcian* l. 9. *Non auſi recuſare*) but now out of uſe.

Fio factus] This verb is properly a *Neuter paſſive*, as ending in *o* like an Active, and yet ſignifying like a Paſſive. But it is not properly placed in this Rule. For this Rule (at leaſt in my apprehenſion of it) intends only ſuch Verbs as form an irregular preterperfect tenſe from themſelves: but *fio* forms neither *factus*, as *Diomedes* l. 1. ſaith it doth, nor any other preterperf. from it ſelf, but wanting a preterperfect tenſe of its own, as *Voſſius* and *Farnaby* ſay, borrows one from another verb, and ſo belongs upon that account to the Rule following, *Quadam præteritum verba accipiunt aliunde.* The verb that it borrows its preterperfect from is *facio*, formerly uſed. Whence that of *Nigidius Figulus* cited by both *Voſſius* and *Saturnius*, *Id quod dica hujuſmodi eſt; ποιῶ facit, ποιεῖται facitur, ποιεῖν facere.* Thence not only thoſe compounds of this verb *afficior*, *perficior*, *&c.* Yet in uſe, but ſome others alſo grown out of uſe, as *parvifaciatur* written by *Titinnius in Quincto*, and *ſatisfacitur* by *Varro* in *Cynico*, as *Voſſius* from *Nonius*, and *Priſcian* ſhews, *Farnaby* p. 42. *Saturn.* l. 6. *c.* 5. *Voſſ. Analog.* l. 3. *c.* 38. *Danef.* l. 3. *c.* 15.

Soleo ſolitus ſum] *Solitus* is from *ſolitum*, and that from *ſolui*, which alſo antiently hath been in uſe, though now it be diſuſed. Thence *Sall.* l. 2. *Hiſtoriar.* cited by *Priſcian* l. 9. *Neque ſubſidiis uti ſoluerat compoſitis.* And *Cælius* l. 7. *Annal. in Nonius*, *Duos & ſeptuaginta Victoris domum deportaviſſe faſces, qui ductoribus hoſtium ante ſoluerint ferri.* Of this verb *Saturnius* ſaith he reads no ſuch Participle as *ſolituri*: and *Charisius* ſaith it hath no future tenſe, becauſe one cannot be ſaid to have accuſtomed himſelf to that which but ſhall be.

Saturn.

Saturn. l. 6. c. 5. *Voſſ. Analog.* l. 3. c. 21.

Mœreo ſum mœſtus : ſed Phocæ nomen habetur]*Voſſius* in his Grammar declines *mœreo* with *mœſtus ſum*: and ſo *Duiſburgenſius* on *Deſpauterius*, and *Farnaby* and *Burles*. Yet as *Farnaby* ſo *Voſſius* hath a marginal Note intimating as if *mœſtus* were no participle, but, as *Phocas* thought a noun; *Niſi mœſtus potius nomen eſt, ut videtur.* But what there he ſpeaks doubtingly of, in his *Analog.* l. 3. c. 24. he, and not *Saturnius* only, or *Rhenius*, doth confidently affirm. *At mœſtus nomen eſt; non participium, uti putârunt.* I ſee not why *mœreo* might anciently have formed *mœrui*, and thence *mœritum*, and by a Syncope *martum*, and thence by a change of *r* into *s* (which is an ordinary change) *mœſtum* and ſo *mœſtus*. But on the other ſide I find degrees of compariſon *mœſtior* and *mœſtiſſimus* formed from this word, whereas none ſuch, that I meet with, are formed from the Participles of the reſt of theſe Neuter-paſſives; and that may be a preſumption, that it is no Participle like them, but a Noun; yet not infallible neither, becauſe I find no comparing of *feſſus*, or *laſſus*, which yet are ſuppoſed to be Nouns, and not Participles.

The *Grammar of Gryphiſwald.* together with theſe verbs, ranks and reckons up thoſe, which beſides their active preterperfect tenſe, have alſo a preterperfect tenſe of the paſſive form, as *prandeo prandi pranſus ſum; cœno cœnavi cœnatus ſum, &c.* And well they may, for ought I know be reckoned here, upon the account of their Paſſive preterperfect tenſe, though upon the account of their Redundancie they be treated of in another Rule.

Q. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus: The declining of the words.

Gaudeo, gaudes, gauſus ſum, gaudere, gauiſũ,
Fido, fidis, fiſus ſum, fidere, fiſum,
Audeo, audes, auſus ſum, audere, auſum,
Fio, fis, factus ſum, fieri, factus,

Soleo,

Soleo, ſoles, ſolitus ſum, ſolere, ſolitum,
Mœreo, mœres, mœſtus ſum, mœrere.

Thus far of Verbs declined with an *Irregular Preterperfect* tenſe formed from *themſelves.*

CHAP. XIV.

Qu. **WHich is the Rule for thoſe verbs that are declined with a preterperfect tenſe borrowed from another verb?**

An. The Rule for thoſe verbs that are declined with a preterperfect borrowed from ſome *other verb* is this:

De verbis præteritum mutuantibus.

Quædam præteritum verba accipiunt aliunde.

Quædam præteritum verba.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That ſome verbs which have no regular preterperfect tenſe of their own, are yet declined with the preterperfect tenſe of another verb, which ſo ſupplies the room of their preterperfect tenſe, as if it were their own.

Qu. **How many ſorts of verbs doth your Grammar here ſpeak of, that do borrow a preterperfect from another verb?**

An. There be three ſorts of verbs here ſpoken of which borrow a preterperfect tenſe from another verb, The firſt is ſome *Inceptives* in *ſco*: the ſecond is ſome *particular* verbs in *o*; the third is ſome *particular* verbs in *or*.

Qu. **What ſaith your Grammar touching** Inceptives **in** ſco?

An. Touching verbs Inceptives in *ſco*, our Grammar ſaith this:

Inceptivè in ſco.

Inceptivum in ſco ſtans pro primario adoptat
Præteritum ejuſdem verbi: vult ergo tepeſco
A tepio tepui, ferveſco a ferveo ferbui.

Qu.

Qu. **what is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That verbs Inceptives in *sco* ſtanding for (that is, uſed or taken in the ſignification of) thoſe primative verbs, that they are derived from, are declined with the preterperfect tenſes of thoſe primative verbs, from which they are derived.

¶ *Inceptivum in sco*] A verb *Inceptive* is properly ſuch a verb as betokens the beginning, or increaſe of any action, or paſſion, and may, ſaith *Rhenius*, be expounded by *incipio* or *fio*: as *labaſco*, i. e. *incipio labare*; *mature ſco*, i. e. *fio maturus*. Not all *Inceptives* are declined with a borrowed preterperfect tenſe, but only thoſe that are formed from *verbs*: (for thoſe that are formed from *nouns* are declined with no preterperfect at all) and of thoſe that are formed from *verbs*, thoſe only are ſo declined, that are formed from verbs in *uſe*, having preterperfect tenſes, from which they are derived (an example of which putting we have in that of *Virgil*, *Incipiunt agitata tumeſcere* i. e. *tumere*, *vel tumeſieri*) for if the primitive have no preterperfect tenſe, or be out of uſe, then the inceptive is not declined with any preterperfect tenſe; one only that I know of, being excepted, namely *evileſco*, which in *Suetonius* hath *evilui*, though no ſuch verb as *evileo* be read. *Voſſ. Etymolog.* p. 142. If any meet with any more, he may add them. It is very pertinent, that which *Saturnius* ſpeaking of theſe verbs ſaith, namely that, *Etſi vis inchoativa repugnet*, *ut præteritum habeant perfectum*, *authoritate tamen uſuque prævalente illud ipſum aut ex ſeſe habent*, *aut certe a ſuis primitivis* (*quanquam a nominibus deducta præterito perfecto carere exiſtimaverim*) *permutuantur*, *ut quod naturâ inchoatum eſt*, *id arte perficiatur*, *&c. Saturn. Merc. Major.* l. c. c. 16.

Qu. **what other verbs doth your Grammar reckon up, which end in o, and borrow a preterperfect tenſe from ſome other verb?**

An.

An. The words in *o* which are declined with a borrowed preterperfect tense, are (with the preterperfect tenses which they borrow, and the verbs from which they borrow them) by our Grammar reckoned up thus:

A video cerno vult vidi.

A video cerno vult vidi; a concutio vult
Preteritum quatio concussi; a percutioque
Percussi ferio: a mingo vult mejo minxi:
A sedeo sido vult sedi, a suffero tollo
Sustuli; & a fuo sum fui; a tulo vite fero tuli:
A sto sisto steti tantum pro stare: furoque
Insanivi a verbo ejusdem significati.

Q. **What is the meaning of this branch of the Rule?**

An. The meaning of this branch of the Rule is this: That *cerno* [to see] borrows *vidi* from *video*; *quatio* borrows *concussi* from *concutio*; *ferio* borrows *percussi* from *percutio*; *mejo* borrows *minxi* from *mingo*; *sido* borrows *sedi* from *sedeo*; *tollo* borrows *sustuli* from *suffero*; *sum* borrows *fui* from *fuo*; *fero* borrows *tuli* from *tulo*; *sisto* [in the sense of *standing* only] borrows *steti* from *sto*; and *furo* borrows *insanivi* from *insanio*.

¶ *A video cerno*] Of this see before in *No sit vi.*

Quatio concussi] *Quassi*, if read, is rare: therefore *concussi* which is ordinary, is ordinarily declined with this verb, as the preterperfect tense of it. But see before in *Tio ssi.*

Percussi ferio] *Ferio*, as *Vossius* from *Charisius* notes, anciently had *ferii* for its preterperfect tense, which now is grown out of use. And though *Servius* on *Virg. Æn.* 7. refuse not *feriturum*, nor *Petrarcha feritum*, saying in 8. *Africæ*, *Pax populis ducibusque placet fœdusque feritum*, yet they are not to be followed therein.

Mejo minxi] *Diomedes* allows of *meii* of *mingo*, whence this is said to borrow a preterperfect tense, *Vossius* wonders how it came to be so, as it is now in use, being

ing an obſolete verb. *Phocas*, *Diomedes*, and *Priſcian* have it. And upon the account of their *Authority* doubtleſs it was anew taken up *Voſſ. de Etym* p. 155 *Alvar.* p. 248.

Sido vult ſedi] That *ſido* borrows *ſedi* from *ſedeo*, that o' *Seneca de Benef.* l. 2. c. 8. ſhews: *Cum ſubſedit cupiditas, &c.* Yet *Columella*. l. 12. c. 24. hath the proper preterperfect of this verb: *Patiemur picem conſidere, & cum conſiderit, aquam eliquabimus. Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 26. *Daneſ. Schol.* l. 2. c. 15.

A ſuffero tollo ſuſtuli] *Tollo*, or *tulo*, as they did anciently expreſs it, of old had *tetuli*: inſtead of which the compound *ſuſtuli* is now in uſe: but that is not from *ſuffero*, as here is ſaid, but from *ſuſtollo*: for *ſuffero* itſelf borrows its preterperfect tenſe from *ſuſtollo*. Now that is read in *Plaut. Mil. Glor.* 2 3. *Credo hercle has ſuſtollat ædes totas, atque hinc in crucem. Catull. Carm. de Nupt. Pel. & Thet. Candiaque intorti ſuſtollant vela rudentes. Cæl. Aurelian.* l. 1. *Erit igitur ſuſtollendus ægrotans ſubjectione manuum ex utrâque alarum parte.* So from *atollo* or *attulo* is *attuli*; from *abſtollo* or *abſtulo* is *abſtuli*; from *contollo contuli*; and from *protollo protuli*, though thoſe preterperfect tenſes be not now declined ordinarily with thoſe verbs, but rather with the compounds of *fero*, *offero*, *confero*, *profero. Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 37.

Et a fuo ſum fui] *Fuo* is read in *Plaut. Bacch.* 1. 2. *Ne phœnix factis tuis fuam. Id. Capt.* 2. 3. 71. *Caveto mihi iratus fuas. Id. Perſ.* 1. 1. 52. *Cave fuas mihi in quæſtione. Virg. Æn.* 10. *Tros Tyriuſve fuat, nullo diſcrimine agetur. Plaut. Capt.* 2. 2. 10. *Si fuat. occaſio*: and in many places more. *Par. Lex. Plaut. Sarurn.* p. 280.

A tulo rite fero tuli] For *tuli* they anciently ſaid *tetuli*. Hence *Plaut. Amph.* 2. 2. *Oſculum tetuli tibi. Id. Rud.* 4. 1. *Volupe eſt hodie me his mulierculis tetuliſſe auxilium. Ter. And.* 4. 6. *Si id ſciſſem, nunquam hus tetuliſſem pedem. Plaut. Menæch.* 2. 3. *Huc*

is

in hanc urbem pedem nisi hodie nunquam intro tetuli. Now that reduplication is grown out of use in this word.

A sto sisto steti tantum pro stare] That is, *sisto* the neuter [to *stand*] hath *steti*, whereas *sisto* the active [to *make to stand*] hath *stiti*. Of which see before in *To sisti*.

Furoque insanivi a verbo ejusdem significati] That is *furo* borrows *insanivi* from *insanio*. In *Sedulius* l. 1. *operis paschatis*, as *Vossius* saith, there is read *furui*. *Nec minus & Darii furuerunt jussa tyranni*. But in any Classick Authour, you will neither meet with preterperfect nor Supine of this verb. Yea *furo* it self, saith *Vossius*, is insolent. Yet it was used by *Varro*, as *Priscian* saith, who bids it be declined, *furis, furit*. *In Arat.* l. 11. there is read, *cui pelagus tellusque furunt*. *Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 30.

Hither may be referred *gigno*, which borrows its preterperfect *genui*, from the old verb *geno*. Of which see above, *Gigno, pono, cano*. So *nexo, nexas*, hath *nexui* from *necto*, or *nexo*; *Lavo, lavas*, hath *lavi*, from *luo, lavis, &c.* Of which before.

Qu. **What particular verbs in** or **doth your Grammar here reckon up, which borrow their preterperfect from other verbs?**

An. The particular verbs in *or*, which borrow a preterperfect from other verbs are by our Authour reckoned up thus.

Sic poscunt vescor. *Sic poscunt vescor, medeor, liquor, reminiscor*
Præteritum a pascor, medeor, liquefio, recordor.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this part of the Rule?**

An. The meaning of this part of the Rule is this: That *vescor* in the declining of it, borrows from *pascor* its preterperfect *pastus* to be declined withal, so *medeor* borrows *medicatus* from *medicor*; *liquor* borrows *liquefactus* from *liquefio*; and *reminiscor* borrows *recordatus* from *recordor*.

¶ *Sic*

¶ *Sic poſcunt*] It is not to be thought, that theſe preterperfect tenſes, *paſtus*, *medicatus*, *liquefactus*, *recordatus* are the preterperfect tenſes of thoſe verbs which borrow them from their own verbs: for the borrowers of them have no preterperfect tenſes of their own: but this is all, that for the ſupply of their deſect of preterperfect tenſes, it is grown an uſe to name the preterperfect tenſes of the other verbs of like ſenſe with them in the room of theirs. And ſo *Phocas*, *Ad ſupplementum declinationis defectivis accommadantur*. And the ſame may be ſaid of the reſt before. See *Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 28.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus: The declining of the words.

Tepeſco, tepeſcis, tepui, tepeſcere,
Tepeo, tepes, tepui, tepere
Ferveſco, ferveſcis, fervi, ferveſcere,
Ferveo, ferves, fervi, fervere,
Video, vides, vidi videre, viſum,
Cerno, cernis, vidi, cernere, viſum,
Quatio, quatis, concuſſi [quaſſi] quatere, concuſſum [quaſſum]
Percutio, percutis, percuſſi, percutere, percuſſum,
Ferio, feris, percuſſi, ferire, percuſſum,
[Mingo, mingis, minxi, mingere, mictum,]
Meio, meis, minxi, meiere, mictum,
Sedeo, ſedes, ſedi, ſedere, ſeſſum,
Sido, ſidis, ſedi, ſidere, ſeſſum,
Suffero, ſuffers, ſuſtuli, ſufferre, ſublatum,
Tollo, tollis, ſuſtuli, ſuſferre, ſublatum,
[Fuo, Fuis, fui, fuere, futum,]
Sum, es, fui, eſſe,
[Tulo, tulis, tuli, [tetuli] tulere, latum,]
Fero, fers, tuli, ferre, latum,
Sto, ſtas, ſteti, ſtare, ſtatum,
Siſto, ſiſtis, ſteti, ſiſtere, ſtatum,
Inſanio, inſanis, inſanivi, inſanire, inſanitum,
[Furo] furis, inſanivi, furere, inſanitum,
Paſcor, paſceris, paſtus ſum, paſci, paſtus,

Veſcor, veſceris, paſtus ſum, veſci, paſtus, Medicor, medicaris, medicatus ſum, medicari, medicatus Medeor, mederis, medicatus ſum, mederi, medicatus, Liquefio, liquefis liquefactus ſ. liquefieri, liquefactus, Liquor, liqueris, liquefactus ſum, liqui, liquefactus, Recordor, —aris, recordatus ſum, --ari, --atus, Reminiſcor, --eris, recordatus ſum, --iſci, recordatus,

Hither may be referred *fio*, as being declined with *factus* not formed from it ſelf, but borrowed from the antiquated verb *facior*; So *comperior* formed not with *compertus ſum*, but *comperi*.

And thus far of Verbs Variant. We are now to proceed to Verbs Defectives.

CHAP. XV.

Qu. **How many ſorts of Defective Verbs are there?**

An. Defective verbs may be diſtributed into *two* ſorts, *Leſſer* Defectives, and *Greater* Defectives.

Qu. **Which call you the** Leſſer **Defectives?**

An. The *Leſſer* Defectives are thoſe, whoſe defects or wants are leſſe or fewer.

Qu. **Which call you the** Greater **Defectives?**

An. The *Greater* Detectives are thoſe, whoſe defects or wants are more, or greater; and which from the greatneſs of their wants are called by way of eminency, *Defectives*.

Qu. **Are the Leſſer** Defectives **of one, or of more ſorts?**

An. The *Leſſer* Defectives are of four ſorts.

Firſt, There are ſome that are defective only in *ſome perſon*, as *daris & faris*, which want the firſt perſon of the preſent tenſe in all moods: and ſo *ſcio* which hath no ſuch perſon as *ſci* in the imperative mood.

Secondly, There are ſome that are Defectives only in

in their *preterperfect* tense: as verbs passives, whose actives have no supines.

Thirdly, There are some that are defective only in their *Supines*, as *lambo, mico, &c.*

Fourthly, There are some that are defective both in preterperfect tense and supine, as are all those which have no preterperfect tense.

Qu. **Of what sorts of these Defectives doth your Grammar treat?**

An. The Grammar treats but of the *Second, Third,* and *fourth sort*, namely those that want their *Preterperfect* tense, and those that want their *Supine*, and those that want *both*: the first being so few and inconsiderable as not much to deserving treating upon.

Qu. **What is the Rule that the Grammar gives touching those that are** Defective **in their** preterperfect tense?

An. The Rule for those verbs that are defective in their preterperfect tense is this:

De verbis præterito carentibus.

Præteritum fugiunt vergo, ambigo, glisco, fatisco,
Polleo, nideo: Ad hæc inceptiva ut pueresco:
Et passiva quibus caruere activa supinis:
ut metuor, timeor: meditativa omnia præter
Parturio, esurio, quæ præteritum duo servant.

Præteritum fugiunt.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That there are several sorts of verbs, which are defective in their preterperfect tense, neither having any of their own, nor being declined with any borrowed from some other verb.

¶ *Præteritum fugiunt*] The word *fugiunt* here is *operative*, intimating not only that these verbs have no preterperfect tense of their own, but that they do not so much as borrow any preterperfect tense from other verbs to be declined withal, like those in the

foregoing Rule, who though they have no preterperfect tense of their own, yet cannot properly be said to be defective in preterperfect tense, because by use and custome, which is Law in *words*, as well as *things*, their want of that is supplyed from others, which have it: and what they have, they cannot properly be said to want, though they do but borrow what they have: as he cannot be said to want a horse to go his journey with, that hath a horse, though but a borrowed one, to ride upon.

Qu. **What sort of Defectives doth your Grammar first mention in this Rule?**

An. The Grammar in this Rule *first* mentions some *particular verbs*, which are not declined with any preterperfect tense, and they are these six, *vergo, ambigo, glisco, fatisco, Polleo, nideo.*

Vergo, ambigo.

¶ *Vergo*] From this verb *Diomedes* forms *versi*, but without any Authour, and so not with any authority.

Nideo] This verb is looked upon as out of use. *Nideo simplex insolens*, saith *Danes.* But the compound of it, *renideo*, is used. *Hor. 2. Carm. Od. 18. Non tibur, neque aureum Mea renidet in domo lacunar. Stat. Theb. 10. Emicat effigies & sparsa orichalca renident*, Yet without preterperfect tense. *Quidam ei praeteritum tribuunt renidui* (saith *Vossius*) *sed absque idoneo auctore. Simplex ejus est nideo, verum non est in usu. De Etymolog. p. 106. Danes. Schol. l. 2. c. 15.*

Qu. **May there any more of this sort be added hither?**

An. To those may be added also these, *labo, glabro, densco, aveo, flaveo, liveo, ceveo, clueo, liquet, ringo, ringor, attollo, sussero* for *patior*, and *calvor.*

¶ There be many more words, which have no preterperfect tense of their own: but being declined with the preterperfect tenses of other verbs, they pass for such as do not want them: as *lavo* of the first conjugation, which hath *lavi*, not of its own, which should be

be *lavavi*, but of *lavo lavis* of the third. *Flaveo* and *liveo* are said by ſome to have *flavi*, and *livi*, as *Voſſius* notes, but without any good authority. For *ſuffero Voſſius* gives this reaſon, becauſe *ſuſtuli* and *ſublatum retinent tollendi ſignificationem: ac proinde ea ſuffero ſibi nequit vindicare: ſed ad veram originem pertinent, quæ eſt tollo, vel potius ſupollo. De Etymolog.* p. 120. Mr. *Farnab.* adds *pœnitet.* But that of *Ovid. Teque fovunt iræ pœnituiſſe tuæ*, ſeems to intitle it to a preterperfect tenſe.

Qu. **After theſe particular verbs named, what ſort of verbs wanting their preterperfect tenſe doth your Grammar proceed unto?**

An. After theſe particular words, which want the preterperfect tenſe the Grammar next proceeds to *Inceptives* in *ſco*, which alſo want their preterperfect tenſe, as is ſaid, *Ad hæc inceptiva, ut pueraſco.* *Ad hæc inceptiva.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of that branch of the Rule?**

An. The meaning of that branch of the Rule is this: That ſuch inceptives as *pueraſco*, that is, Inceptives formed not from verbs, but from *nouns* (as *repueraſco* is from *puer*) are not declined with any preterperfect tenſe: as *herbeſco, igneſco, ſylveſco, lapideſco, miteſco, integraſco*, from *herba, ignis, ſylva, lapis, mitis, integer.*

¶ This diſtinction of *Inceptives* formed from *verbs* and from *nouns* paſſeth current amongſt Grammarians: and yet it is poſſible, that it may be without ground, thoſe which are ſaid to be formed from *nouns*, being formed from *verbs* out of uſe. So *Voſſius* obſerves that *calveſco* is derived from *calvus, caneſco* from *canus*, and *feneſco* from *ſenex*, and yet, ſaith he, *calveo* is in *Plin. Caneo* in *Virg.* and *feneo* in *Catull.* And accordingly *herbeo, igneo, ſylveo, lapideo, miteo, integro, repuero*, may have been in uſe, though now diſuſed. Yet as to the preterperfect the Rule holds, that thoſe have the preterperfect of their primitive Verbs *(ubi o-*

pus, as Mr. *Farnab.* saith) where need is, which are formed from primitive verbs in use: but of those which are formed from primitives out of use, few are declined with a preterperfect tense: *evilesco* is named, which hath *evilui*, though *evilco* be not read: but few, if any else. See *Voss. Etymolog.* p. 111. 112. 142. *Saturn.* l. 4. c. 16. *Rhen.* p. 139. 184. Where is a Catalogue of the Inceptives derived from verbs, and derived from nouns.

Qu. **What sort doth our Authour next speak of?**

An. The next sort of verbs wanting preterperfect tenses, which our Authour speaks of is *Passives* formed from *Actives* wanting Supines. So he

Et passiva, quibus carnere activa Supinis,
Ut metuor, timeor.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this branch of the Rule?**

An. The meaning of this branch of the Rule is this: That those passives have no preterperfect tenses, which are formed from actives having no Supines.

¶ The preterperfect tense of the Passive being formed from the Supine of the Active, it must needs be that the Active having no Supine, the Passive can have no preterperfect tense. *Sublatâ causâ tollitur effectus.*

Qu. **What is the last sort of verbs wanting preterperfect tense, which our Authour speaks of?**

An. The last sort of verbs wanting preterperfect tense which our Authour speaks of, are certain verbs in *urio*, called here *Meditatives*, and by others *Desideratives*. So he,

Meditativa omnia.

——*Meditativa omnia prater*
Parturio, esurio, quæ præteritum duo servant.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this branch of the Rule?**

An. The meaning of this branch of the Rule is this: That *Meditative*, or *Desiderative verbs* ending in *urio*, do

do all want preterperfect tense: *parturio* and *esurio* being excepted only.

¶ Neither are all verbs ending in *urio* Desiderative or Meditative verbs: for *ligurio* and *scaturio*, *prurio* and *curio* or *cucurio* are no desideratives, as not being expressive of any desire, which is the property of desiderative verbs, as *esurio*, saith *Vossius*, is *cupio edere*, so *parturio* is *cupio parere*. Neither do all desiderative verbs end in *urio*, for *capto* is a desiderative verb, as signifying *capere cupio*, yet it ends not in *urio*. Therefore the Rule is strictly to be understood, not of *all verbs in urio*, nor of *all Meditatives* whatsoever, but of *such Meditatives only* as end in *urio*, as is aforesaid.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus: The declining of the words.

Vergo, vergis, vergere,
Ambigo, Ambigis, ambigere,
Glisco, glisces, glisscere,
Fatisco, fatisces, fatiscere,
Polleo, polles, pollere,
[*Nideo, nides, nidere*] or rather
Renideo, renides, renidere,
[*Pueraſco, pueraſcis, pueraſcere*] or rather
Repueraſco, repueraſcis, repueraſcere,
Metuor, metueris, metui,
Timeor, timeris, timeri,
Parturio, parturis, parturivi, parturire, parturitum,
Esurio, esuris, esurivi, esurire, esuritum.

And thus far of Verbs that are *defective* in their *preterperfect tense*. We must next proceed to those that are *defective in Supine*.

CHAP. XVI.

Qu. What Rule doth your Grammar give for those that are defective in their Supines?

An. The Grammar Rule for Defectives in Supines is this:

Verba ſupinum rarò admittentia.
Hæc rarò, aut nunquam retinebunt verba ſupinum
Lambo, mico micui, &c.

Qu. What is the meaning of this Rule?

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That there be many verbs which have preterperfect tenſes, whoſe *Supines* yet are ſeldom, or never read, as *lambo lambi*, *mico micui*, *&c.*

¶ *Hæc rarò*] This word *rarò* is *operative*, importing thus much, that of ſome of the verbs here named in this Rule, *ſometimes*, though *ſeldome*, there be read Supines, or at leaſt Participles derived from their Supines. This they ſhould conſider, that ſtumbling by chance on ſome *Supine*, or *derivative* from ſome Supine of ſome of theſe verbs, preſently like ill natured Scholars flye with indignation in the face of their Maſter: or elſe crying εὕρηκα εὕρηκα clap their wings and crow over, cenſure and condemn poor *Lilly*, as guilty of ſome unpardonable errour, who yet ſaw without doubt, the moſt of what they find of this nature; but for the *rarity* of it, left it unmentioned, yet included under this term of *rarò*, as a thing, though *ſometimes* yet *ſeldom* read: and ſo the Title of his Rule, if they would mind it, is *Verba ſupinum rarò admittentia*: and the Rule it ſelf begins with, *Hæc rarò, aut nunquam retinebunt verba ſupinum*, which for haſt to catch a ſhadow, they mind not.

Lambo] *Alvarus* ſaith *lambitum* is found in *Priſcian*, but yet without teſtimony of any [illegible] to avouch it

it. Yea *Voſſius* ſaith, *plerique Grammaticorum agnoſcunt; ſed auctoritatem requiro.* I ſuppoſe ancienter ones, for I find none of the Moderns, but *Rhenius* and the *Grammar of Gryphiſwald.* that have it. *Alvar.* p. 244. *Voſſ. Analog.* l. 3. c. 25.

Mico micui] The ſimple verb *mico* hath no ſupine. But the compounds of it, as *dimico*, and *emico*, are ſaid to have *dimicatum* and *emicatum*: Whence in *Seneca* is read *emicaturus.* l. *de Conſol. ad Helviam*, c. 11. *Ad ſumma emicaturis.* And yet in thoſe, as from *micui* is formed no ſupine, but all as from *micavi.* And who knows, but the meaning of our Authour in adding *micui* to *mico* might be to note, that though in the compounds of this verb from *micavi* was formed *micatum*, yet from *micui* neither in the ſimple nor compound, was any thing formed. Of *intermico* is formed *intermicatio*: but no ſupine or participle is extant of it, that I ſee.

Rudo] *Rhenius* and the *Gryphiſw. Gram.* have *rudi ruditum*: but none, that I meet with elſe. *Appul.* indeed in *Met.* 7. hath *rudivi*, whence *ruditus*, the braying of an Aſſe, may come, as *rugitus* the roaring of a Lyon, from *rugivi*: but that, if allowed, is from *rudio*, whoſe Supine is, if any thing, *rudītum*, and ſo is nothing to *rudītum* of *rudo*: though *rudio* it ſelf, out of *Appuleius*, you may be ſeeking.

Scabo] This verb hath no Advocate to plead any thing for it, why it ſhould have a Supine, and ſo is gone, if I may ſo ſay, at the Common-Law.

Parco peperci] So Mr. *Bird.* But *Rhenius*, *the Gryphiſw. Gram*, *Shirley*, *Deſpauter.* *Duisburg.* *Voſſius* in his Grammar, *Harris*, *Hayne*, *Farnaby*, *Burles*, *Daneſ.* yea, and *Alvarus* are for two ſupines from this verb, *parſum* as from *parſi*, and *parcitum* as from *peperci.* Yet this granted, our Authour is in no errour: for it is but *raro*, not very often that either is found. For *parſum Varro & Livie* l. 25. are quoted out of *Priſcian* by *Voſſius.* And for *parcitum* two places are named. *Plin.* l. 30.

l. 30. c. 4. *Italiæ parcitum eſt vetere interdicto Patrum, ut diximus.* Where yet ſome read, *Italiæ parci vetere interdicto Patrum diximus*, as both *Voſſius* and *Alvarus* ſay. Perhaps the Authour writ at firſt *parci tum*; and thence by ſome tranſcriber was made *parcitum*. Again *Appul.* l. 8. *Met. Leopolemo parcito lanceam dimiſit.* The conſideration of which two places made the ingenious & learned *Saturnius* retract afterward, what he had written and publiſhed in the firſt Edition of his *Mercurius*, viz. that *parco peperci* had no ſupines. But no neceſſity of that retraction. For admitting all, that can be ſaid from theſe two places, without queſtioning the reading of the firſt, yet it follows not that *parco peperci* hath any Supine formed from it, unleſs it could be aſſured, that *parcitum* were formed from *peperci*, and not rather from *parcui*, from which *Voſſius* in his *Analog.* l. 3. c. 25. diſtinctly ſaith it is formed, bringing theſe very places for proof of it. *A parcui eſt ſupinum parcitum, Plin.* l. 30. c. 4. *&c.* From whence alſo *parcitas* uſed by *Seneca* 1. *de clement.* will be derived. And for *parcui*, that of *Nævius*, *Suo labori nullus parcuit*, is quoted by *Nonius*, as both *Voſſius* and *Alvarus* ſay: From *parſum* comes *parſurus*. Thence *Sueton.* in *Tib. Cæſ.* c. 62. *Ac ne reliquis quidem nepotibus parſurus creditur.* So in *Ner.* c. 37. *Multaſque nec dubias ſignificationes ſæpe jecit, ne reliquis quidem ſe parſurum Senatoribus.* Alſo *parſimonia* uſed by *Cicero* and every body. But our Authour in adding *peperci* to *parco*, ſhews, that he meant not to go againſt any thing of that, 'tis *parco peperci*, not *parco parſi* that he ſaith *ſeldom* or *never* hath any ſupine. And in conſideration of what is ſaid above, you may now chuſe, whether it ſhall be *rarò* or *nunquam*, that *parco peperci* hath any; and if you will ſay *nunquam*, for me you may. *Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 25. *Alvar.* p. 244. *Saturn.* l. 6. c. 5. *Farnab.* p. 37. *Duisburg.* p. 117. *Hayne* p. 74. *Daneſ. Schol.* l. 2. c. 15.

Diſpeſco] With our Authour here are *Alvarus*, *Richerius*

berius, Saturnius, Bird, Hayne, Harris, Rhenius, and the *Gryphiſw. Grammar*. But *Deſpauterius, Voſſius, Ramus, Farnaby, Burles* are againſt him, all giving to this verb *diſpeſcitum* for its Supine. But upon what authority? None that I ſee produced by them, but their own words. Unleſs this be it, that *Priſcian* l. 10. doth admit of it, as of *compeſcitum, diſcitum*, and *poſcitum*. But if that be it, then in l. 11. where he comes to treat of Participles in *rus*, he recalls himſelf, as *Alvarus* notes, and teacheth that the verbs, from whence theſe are ſuppoſed to come, do want Supines. In ſhort, 'tis either *never* ſaid, or but *ſeldom* ſaid: and either way 'tis according to what our Authour here ſaith, *rarò aut nunquam*.

Poſco] Two *Grammarians, Ramus* and *Richerius* give this verb a ſupine. But I have fourteen for thoſe two (great odds, ſeven to one) that are againſt its having. And yet *Voſſius* as well as *Ramus* cites *Seneca* ſaying (but I know not where) *expoſcitum caput*, which, if it be, muſt come from *poſcitum*. But our Authours *rarò aut nunquam* will have place here: here's *rarò* for the compound, and *nunquam* for the ſimple; the one read once, and the other never.

Diſco] Here the Grammarians run all on our ſide again. Only *Ramus* gives a ſupine to this verb. His Authority is *Priſcian*. But he, as we noted on *Diſpeſco*, in his tenth Book was for it, in his eleventh againſt it. *Rhenius*, and *Voſſius*, and *Alvarus* tell us that *Appul.* in *Phædone* hath *diſciturus*; but; (not to ſay, as *Alvarus* doth, that that Authours ſpeech *non ſemper eruditis probatur*) if ever it was ſaid, for ought appears, it was but ſeldom, *rarò aut nunquam* as our Authour ſpeaks. Hither refer *addiſco, condiſco, ediſco, perdiſco*.

Compeſco] The ſame falls out in this verb as in *diſpeſco*. The ſame are for, and the ſame are againſt its having a ſupine: the grounds on both ſides are the ſame: and therefore what was ſaid of that, may ſerve for this.

Concinisco]

Quinisco] This is said here, as before, by an *Aphæresis* for *conquinisco*, the compound of *quinisco*, which if any thing be, is in use. None, that I see, gives it any supine, and so we have no more to do with it.

Dego] This verb on every hand is denied a Supine, and I have nothing to say for it; nor for *prodigo*, which likewise is destitute of Supine.

Ango] From this verb *Priscian* forms *anctum*: and *Diomedes anxum*. From *anxum* undoubtedly is *anxius*, and *anxietas*: but neither *anxum* nor *anctum* are now in use. *Voss. Analog.* l. 3. c. 27. *Alvar.* p. 247. *Richer.* p. 64. *Ram.* p. 91.

Sugo] Some few, *Despauterius*, *Alvarus*, and two or three more of our *Country-men* are with our Authour herein: but many more are against him, and are for *fugo* having *suctum* in the Supine. So *Vossius*, *Farnaby*, *Rhenius*, *Ramus*, &c. But why so? Why in *Plin.* l. 8. c. 36. there is read the noun verbal *Suctus*. Speaking of *Bears* he saith, that sometimes *priorum pedum suctu vivunt* (they *quarter themselves upon their claws*, as the ingenious Authour of *Hudibras* doth expresse it.) The same word he hath again, l. 9. c. 30. and l. 28. c. 3. Again, though *Jasz-Berengi* reckon *exfugo* amongst those that want Supine, yet in *Hor.* 5. *Epod.* there is read *exfuctus*. *Exfucta uti medulla & aridum jecur amoris esset poculum*. Hence undeniably appears that *exfuctum*, and *suctum* too, hath been in use: but the supine *suctum*, or the simple participle *suctus*, are either *seldom* or *never* read: and therefore still no errour in our Authour for all this.

Lingo] With our Authour herein are *Despauterius*, and *Duuburgensis*, *Ramus*, *Richerius*. *Sbirley*, *Bird*, *Harris* and the *Rudiment Writer*. But a greater number give this verb *linctum* for its supine: as *Alvarus*, *Saturnius*, *Hayne*, *Vossius*, *Farnaby*, *Danes*, *Burles*, *Rhenius*, the *Gryph. Gram.* and *Jasz-Berengi*. And why so? Why *linctus* the Participle is read in *Plin.* l. 35. 15. *Sulphur prodesse & suspiriosis linctum*. Yea *linctu* the Supine

pine is read in his l. 3. c. 17. *Assus lapis prodest ob phthisicis linctu.* So *linctus* the verbal, in his l. 3. c. 9. *Multi tussim veterem linctu salis discussêre.* But this is but *one* Authour: nor is the Participle, Supine, or Verb read any more than each of them once, that I see yet, in him: and that will ſtill ſuit with our Authours *rarò*, though not with his *nunquam*. If better ſtore be found, then, and now too, if you will; do as Mr. *Hayne* hath done, and put this word out of the Rule. *Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 27. *Saturn.* l. 6. c. 5. Of the compounds of this verb *elingo* is by *Jaſz-Berengi* reckoned amongſt them that want Supine: but *pollingo* is by *Voſſius* declined *pollingo, pollinxi, pollinctum.* Whence the verbal *pollinctor*, as he ſaith, *Etymolog.* p. 116.

Xingo] Neither *Deſpauterius*, nor *Dauburg.* nor *Ricberius* make any exception of this word from the general Rule: So that by their Rules *ningo*, or *ninguo*, as it was anciently written, ſhould make *ninxi* and *ninctum:* but in as much as they give us nothing but their bare word for it, and that but in a general Rule, without any example, and there be many (twelve that I have againſt three) that expreſly except it, and deprive it of Supine, therefore it is like, for me, to go ſtill for a defective in Supine.

Satagoque] This verb is on all hands concluded to want Supine, like *dego*, and *prodigo*; and ſo is *Pſallo*, ſo that I paſs them by.

Volo] The generality of Grammarians deny this Verb a Supine, as well as our Authour: But the *Gram. of Gryphiſw.* very confidently gives it two for ſureneſs, *volitum* and *vultum*. *Rhenius* with more caution tells us, that it hath *volitum apud recentiores.* Yea that ſome ſuch thing hath been, ſeemed to *Voſſius*, who though he give [this verb no Supine, yet ſaith, *Ab inuſitato ſupino volitum eſt volitus, & inde per Syncopen voltus, ſeu vultus: ut a colitum, cultum, cultus.* But ſtill we are but at *rarò, aut nunquam* for all this. To the compounds of this verb *nolo* and *malo*,

none,

none, not the *Gryphiſw. Grammar* is ſo kind as to give any Supines, and therefore them I paſs over without more adó.

Tremo] So *Deſpaut. Tremo ponitur abſque Supino.* And ſo every body elſe, that I meet with: to which we may add the compounds of it *contremo* and *intremo.* And the ſame I ſay for *ſtrideo*, and *ſtrido*: for *flaveo*, and *liveo*; for *aveo*, and *paveo*; for *conniveo* and *ferveo*, and the compounds of this latter *deferveo*, and *efferveo*. So that we ſhall paſs them alſo over without more ado, and go on.

A nuo compoſitum ut renuo] *Stephanus* and his Abbreviatour *Trebellius* decline this verb with the ſupine *renutum.* And accordingly *Faſc-Berengi* ſo declines it; and with him is *Saturnius* l. 6. c. 5. But *Farnaby* and *Burles* ſay, that neither *renuo* nor *abnuo* have any ſupines. *Richerius* deprives *nuo* it ſelf of ſupine though his country-man *Ramus* allow it to have one. *Harris* adds *innuo*, yet by the word *ſolis*, he ſeems to mean, that *renuo*, *annuo*, and *innuo* are all the compounds of *nuo* that want the ſupines. But *Shirley* to *renuo* adds *abnuo*, *innuo*, &c. *Hayne* and *Bird* are as general as our Authour, and deprive all of ſupine; whereas not only to *nuo*, but to all the compounds thereof, *abnuo*, *annuo*, *innuo*, *renuo*, *Rhenius* gives ſupines; and ſo the *Gram. of Gryphiſw. Annuo cum ſociis nulla ſupina dabunt*, ſo ſaith *Deſpauterius*; yet his Commentator *Seb. Duisburg.* ſaith *nuo* hath ſupines, *forte & abnuo*, and perhaps *abnuo*, for he ſaith *abnuiturus* is found: but he tells not where. *Alvarus* ſaith *annutum* and *renutum* are found in *Priſcian*, who yet likes them not. In fine, *Alvar. ſaith, Videntur nonnulla ex his aliquando habuiſſe ſupinum unde nomina nutus & renutus reſicta ſunt.* And there is ſenſe methinks in what he ſaith. *Nutus* is in *Virg. An.* 9. *Annuit & totum nutu tremefecit Olympum.* So *Cic. Fam.* 11. 21. *Nutus tuus poteſt hominem incolumem retinere in civitate.* And both that, and *renutus* is in *Plin.* l. 1. Ep. 7. *Nam ego quoque ſimili nutu*

ac

ac renutu respondere voto tuo possum. But whence these but from *nutum* and *renutum*? And as *nuto* (which what can it come from but *nutum?*) is in *Plaut. Menæch.* 4. 2. *Nutat ne loquar*; and else-where. So *abnuto* is in *Plaut. Captiv.* 3. 4. *Quid mihi abnutas? Tibi ego abnuto?* and *Cic.* 3. *de Orat. Quidnam est obsecro? quid te adiri abnutas?* But what can this be from but *abnutum*? It may be seasonable to add here, what *Saturnius* above saith upon occasion of his giving Supines *linctum* and *renutum* to *lingo*, and *renuo*. *Nec est quod hic mihi aliquis reclamet, Numnam igitur dicere licebit lincturus, renutus, ta, tum, & renuturus? Quidni, quantum ad verbi naturam pertinet? Neque enim propterea supinis fraudanda sunt, quia eorum participia in usu non sint. Id quod vel de aliis, quorum participia, aut obscura sunt, aut minus usurpata, dicendum.* Well, if *nuo* and the compounds of it, have *nutum* and *renutum*, *&c.* Yet it is *rare*, that any of them are found, and so our Authour, who is but for *raro aut nunquam*, will be in the right still. These, if you will hear *Danes*, *tunc utaris licebit, quum apud idoneum aliquem auctorem reperies. Schol.* l. 2. c. 15.

A cado, ut incido: præter Occido quod facit occasum, recidoq; recasum] From *occasum* comes *occasurus* in *Cic. pro Mil. Vosq; obsecro, Judices, ut vestra beneficia, quæ in me contulistis, aut in hujus salute augeatis, aut in hujus exitio occasura esse jubeatis.* So *occasus* in *Gell.* l. 17, c. 2. Where citing *sole occaso* from *Novius* in *Atellana*, he adds *sole occaso, non insuavi venustate est*: and then brings a Law out of the twelve Tables, where that word is. *Sol occasus suprema tempestas esto.* From *recasum* is *recasurus* cited by *Vossius* and *Stephanus* from *Cic. ad Att.* l. 4. *Id ego puto, ut multa ejusmodi, ad nihil recasurum.* But the like may be said for *incido*. For *incasurus*, which can come but from *incasum*, is read in *Plin.* l 2. c. 47. *Sed ea accidisse, non quia hæc facta sunt arbitror: verùm hæc ideo facta, quia incasura erant illa.* But this is *raro*

still

still that they are read; and therefore our Authour is not to be taxed for this neither. The like will hardly be read of *accido*, *concido*, *decido*, or any other of the compounds of *cado*, which therefore are reckoned up amongst those that are defective in supine.

Respuo] So *Vossius*: who allows yet *spuo*, and the other compounds of it the supines; which *Jasz Berengi* denies to *conspuo*, and *despuo*. Yet *Stephanus* declines *conspuo* with *consputum*, and *despuo* with *desputum*; and *exspuo* with *exsputum*; and *inspuo* with *insputum*. And indeed from *consputum* is formed *consputo*, read in *Cic. ad Qu. Fr.* l. 2. *Hora fere nonâ, quasi signo dato, Clodiani nostros conspuere cœperunt.* So from *insputum* is formed *insputo*; whence *Plaut. Cap.* 3. 4. *Qui me opus sit insputarier?* *Ib. Quibus insputari saluti fuit, atq; alijs profuit.* I suppose it would be rare to shew either a supine, or a participle from any of these verbs, which made him deny them, though from these derivatives *Vossius* may grant them.

Linquo] Of this word see above, *Mi, ni, pi, qui.*

Luo] From this verb *Claudian* hath *luiturus*: thence though some denie, yet others grant this verb a supine. But see above, *Quod dat ui dat itum*: *Rui ruitum.*

Metuo] Anciently this verb hath had for its Supine *metutum*. Whence *Lucret* l. 5. *Nam cupidè conculcatur nimis ante metutum.* But now neither it, nor *permetuo* compounded of it have any supine.

Cluo] This verb is not so often read as *cluo*: but if it have a preterperfect tense, as *cluo* hath none, yet it hath no more supine than that. And if *Paveus* should think either of these verbs had a supine, because there is *inclytus*, which may be supposed to be derived from thence, there is a Greek word κλυτὸς, from whence it would rather be derived. But perhaps he thought so too, and then we are agreed. So *frigeo*, *calvo*, *sterto*, and the compound of it *disterto*, and *timeo*, I see none pretending to have met with any Supines. Only *Vossius* and *Rhenius* talk of *calumnior* being derived from *calvo*,

as

as if from the Supine *calutum*, formed from *calvi*, like *solutum* from *solvi*: but if ever it was in, yet now it is out of use; and so *Despauterius*. *Calvo calvi facit absque supino. Danesius* saith *frigo tertiæ* hath *frictum*, but *frigeo secundæ caret supinis. Schol.* l. 2. c. 15.

Sic luceo] So *alluceo, diluceo, illuceo, præluceo.* Yet saith *Vossius, Compositum ejus polluceo, quod verbum est ad sacra pertinens, habet polluxi pollutum.* Hence *Macrobius* l. 3 c. 16. *Propriè autem catillones dicebantur, qui ad pollutum Herculis ultimi cum venirent, catillos liguriibant.* And hence in *Plaut. Mostell.* 1. 1. *Obsonate pollucibiliter.*

Et arceo, cujus composita ercitum habent] That the compounds have *ercitum*, as *exercito exercitum*, and *cierceo, coercitum*, as none doubts it; so the participles and verbals *excercitus*, and *coercitus*, *&c.* derived from them prove it. And if the simple verb *arceo* have no supine as well as preterperfect tense, which some, it seems, have denyed it, though *arcui* be both in *Cic.* 11. *Philip.* and *Ovid* 13. *Met.* as *Vossius* notes, yet sure it hath had one: whence *arctus* for *arcitus*, and the frequentative *arcto*, as well as the Supines of the compound Verbs *exercitum*, and *coercitum. Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 22.

Sic a gruo, ut ingruo natum] To which add *congruo*.

Et quæcunque in ui formatur neutra secundæ] As *abhorreo, abstineo, aceo, areo, attineo; calleo, candeo, clareo, colliquo, conticeo; deliqueo, delireo; emineo, egeo, exareo, floreo, frendeo, frondeo; horreo; imminco, indigeo; lacteo, langueo, liqueo; madeo, marceo; niteo; obticeo, palleo, pateo, pertineo, præmineo, prominco; rauceo, renideo, riticeo, rigeo, rubeo; scabreo, sileo, splendeo, sordeo, surdeo, torpeo, tumeo; vigeo, vileo, vireo*, with their respective compounds, besides some before mentioned, as *ferbeo, ferbui, &c.* Yet this Rule is not so general, but that it hath exceptions, as accordingly it follows.

Exceptis oleo, doleo, &c. gaudent hæc namque supino] And yet not all these excepted neither, nor only these. Not all these, for *pateo* hath no supine: nor only these;

for *jaceo*, and *coaleo* have, or have had ſupines. Hence from *jacto* *Stat.* 7. *Theb. Haud vetito nudus jacituræ ſepulchro.* So from *coaleo*, *Tacit.* l. 15. *Coalitum libertate irreverentiam eo Proruiſſe fremen tibus. Id.* 20 *Si Alpes præſidiis firmentur coalitâ libertate deſpecturas Gallias, quem vinium ſuarum terminum velint. A. Gell.* l. 12. c. 1. *Cujus in corpore, cujuſque ex ſanguine concretus homo & coalitus ſit.* And of theſe it is not to be expected, that it punctually ſhould be ſhewn, where they have ſupines. It may ſuffice to produce inſtances of participles formed from their ſupines. Nor is there any great reaſon, that they ſhould be accounted defective in ſupine, whoſe participles derived from their ſupines may be ſhewn. Some ſay *ſtudeo* hath a ſupine *ſtuditum*, though *Duit Burgenſis* from *Diomedes*, ſaith it hath none: neither doth *Stephanus* decline it with any.

Olco] This verb hath been thought by *Priſcian* to make *oletum*. Whence *oletum* the verbal ſubſtantive in *Perſ.* 1. *Satyr. Veto quiſquam fazit oletum.* This *Voſſius* would have derived from the preſent tenſe. I ſee no great reaſon but it may be fetched from *oletum* a ſupine formerly uſed, though now out of uſe, and that formed from *olevi*, which is in uſe in ſome of the compounds of this verb, though in the ſimple *olui* now be only in uſe, from whence they form *olitum*, but yet are as far to ſeek for an example of it, as of *oletum*, but for what they find in ſome of the compounds of it: and when they have found it, are not ſure but it may come from another verb, viz. *olo* of the third conjugation and read, ſaith *Farcus*, in *Plaut. Moſtell.* 1. 1. if he miſtake not his Authour, whom, as I have heard, he ſtudied forty years. See *Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 23. where he ſaith, *Oleo nunc tantum olui & olitum facit*, whereas in his *Etymolog. Lat.* p. 106. Upon *oleo*, *olui*, *olitum* in his Text, he hath this Note in his Margine, *Si modò olitum uſpiam invenitur. Sed antique & oletum fecit.*

Doleo] Hence is read in *Hor.* 15. *Epod. O dolitura mea multum virtute Neæra. Ovid. Met.* 9. *Fab.* 4. *Si quis*

quis tamen Hercule ſiquis Forte deo dolituras erit.

Placeo] Hence *Virg. Æn.* 12. *Nunciis hæc Idmon. Phrygia mea dicta tyranno Haud placitura refer. Plin. Ep.* l. 8. *Interim tamen tanquam placituram, & fortaſſe placibit, expecta.*

Taceoque] Hence *Ter. Eun.* 3. 5. *Tacitus citius audies.* Id. Ad. 3. 4. *Ignotum eſt, tacitum eſt, creditum eſt.* Yet *conticco* and *reticco* compounded thereof have no ſupines.

Parco] A ſupine or participle of this verb is hard to find in any Claſſick Authour. Yet *Alvarus* and *Voſſius* cite *Scævola* and *Jabolenus* ICC. ſaying, *paritum eſſe conditioni. Saturnius* alſo names this word among the reſt, *Quorum omnium ſupina* (as he ſaith) *ac participia in medio uſu. Voſſ. de Anal.* l. 3. c. 24. *Alvar.* p. 238. *Saturn.* l. 6, c. 5.

Item careo] Hence *Juven.* 2. *Sat. Tollere dulcem Cogitat hæredem carituras turture magno.*

Noceo] *Cæſ.* 3. l. c. *Jurejurando accepto nihil his nocituros, ſe Octacilio dediderunt. Sen.* 2. *de Benef. Sunt quædam nocitura impetrantibus, quæ non dare, ſed negare beneficium eſt.*

Pateo] Of this verb ſee before, *Dat patui paſſum.*

Lateoque] *Stephanus* declines this verb without Supine. *Alvarus*, and from *Priſcian* l. 11. ſaith it hath no ſupine. Yet *Voſſius*, *Hayne*, *Farnaby*, *Rhenius*, *Deſpaut. Duisburg. &c.* allow it to have a ſupine. I ſee nothing of authority for it. *Voſſius* only ſaith *ſimplex lateo latus format ex ſe latiturus*, but without example. Yet *latito* is formed from thence. So that it hath, or hath had the ſupines. However *delitco* the compound of it is not found to have any ſupine.

Et valeo] Hence *Ovid.* 1. *Triſt. El.* 3. *Multaque in adverſos effudit verba penates Pro deplorato non valitura viro.*

Caleo] *Ovid. Met.* 13. *Dieſque Det mihi ſacrificos, valituraſque ignibus aras.*

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

The declining of the words.

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus:

Lambo, lambis, lambi, lambere,
Mico, Micas, micui, micare,
Rudo, rudis, rudi, rudere,
Scabo, scabis, scabi, scabere,
Parco, parcis, peperci, parcere, parsum [& *parcitum*]
Dispesco, dispescis, dispescui, dispescere,
Posco, poscis, popoſci, poscere,
Disco, discis, didici, discere,
Compesco, compescis, compescui, compescere,
[*Quinisco, quinisscis, quexi, quinisscere,*]
Dego, degis, degi, degere,
Ango, angis, anxi, angere,
Sugo, sugis, suxi, sugere, suctum,
Lingo, lingis, linxi, lingere, [*linctum,*]
Ningo, ningis, ninxi, ningere,
Satago, satagis, sategi, satagere,
Psallo, psallis, psalli, psallere,
Volo, vis, volui, velle, [*volitum,*]
Nolo, nonvis, nolui, nolle,
Malo, mavis, malui, malle,
Tremo, tremis, tremui, tremere,
Strideo, strides, stridi, stridēre,
Strido, stridis, stridi, stridēre,
Flaveo, flaves, —— flavere,
Liveo, lives, —— livere,
Aveo, aves, —— avere,
Paveo, paves, pavi, pavere,
Conniveo, connives, connivi & connixi, connivere,
Ferveo, ferves, fervi, fervere,
Nuo, nuis, nui, nuere, nutum,
Renuo, renuis, renui, renuere, [*renutum*]
Cado, cadis, cecidi, cadere, casum,
Incido, incidis, incidi, incidere, [*incasum*]
Occido, occidis, occidi, occidere, occasum,
Recido, recidis, recidi, recidere, recasum,

Respue,

Reſpuo, reſpuis, reſpui, reſpuere,
Linquo, linquis, liqui, linquere,
Luo, luis, lui, luere, luitum,
Metuo, metuis, metui, metuere, [*metutum,*]
Cluo, cluis, —— *cluere,*
Frigeo, friges, frixi, frigere,
Calvo, calvis, calvi, calvere,
Sterto, ſtertis, ſtertui, ſtertere,
Timeo, times, timui, timere,
Lucco, luces, luxi, lucere,
Arceo, arces, arcui, arcere,
Gruo, gruis, grui, gruere,
Ingruo, ingruis, ingrui, ingruere,
Oleo, oles, olui, olere, olitum,
Doleo, doles, dolui, dolere, dolitum,
Placeo, places, placui, placere, placitum,
Taceo, taces, tacui, tacere, tacitum,
Pareo, pares, parui, parere, [*paritum*]
Careo, caves, carui, carere, caritum,
Noceo, noces, nocui, nocere, nocitum,
Pateo, pates, patui, patere,
Lateo, lates, latui, latere, [*latitum*]
Valeo, vales, valui, valere, valitum,
Caleo, cales, calui, calere, calitum.

Qu. **Have you any other Verbs to add to this Rule?**

An. To this Rule many verbs more are added, whoſe ſupines, or any thing derived from their ſupines, hardly are read. As of the firſt Conjugation, *elinguo.* Of the ſecond *affulgeo, algeo; dependeo, deturgeo; effulgeo; fulgeo; niveo; pendeo; refulgeo, reſideo; turgeo, urgeo.* Of the third, *antecello, batuo, clango, excello, incello, obtingo, præcello, refello, ſum* with his compounds, *deſum, obſum, inſum, poſſum, &c. Sapio, deſipio, inſipio, reſipiſco, delitеſco, erubeſco, evaneſco, extandeſco, matureſco, refrigeſco, feneſco.* Of the fourth, *cæcutio, geſtio, inceptio, abſilio, proſilio, nupturio, parturio, ſcaturio, canaturio niſturio, veneo.*

Qu. What say you of verbs Inceptives in sco?

An. Touching verbs inceptives in *sco*. I suppose, as for preterperfect tense, so for Supine, they follow their primitive verb, which they stand for, and have what it hath, and want what it wants.

Qu. What say you of verbs that borrow their preterperfect tense?

An. Touching verbs that borrow their preterperfect tense, I supose they follow the use of the verbs, from whom their preterperfect tense is borrowed, having supines if they have them, and having none, where they want them.

Qu. Are there no other verbs used to be referred hither?

An. Hither some do refer several verbs as wanting supines, whereof yet there are to be found supines, or derivatives from their supines, viz. *Participles, Verbals, &c.* at least which are thought by learned persons to have supines. Such are *fateor, audeo, fido, gaudeo, gradior, desino, irascor, misereor, metior, nanciscor, nitor, nascor, neo, obliviscor, operior, ordior, orior, paciscor, proficiscor, patior, depango, circumpango, queror, reor, soleo, tædet, ulciscor, utor.*

¶ From *fateor* comes *fassus* and *fassurus*. Hence *Ovid. Met.* 13. *Ignoscere fassis.* and *Ovid.* 1. *de Ponto*, *Da veniam fasso. Id. Met.* 14. *Quid cuperet fassura fuit.*

Audeo] Hence *ausus, ausurus. Ovid.* 1. *Met. Magnis tamen excidit ausis. Auson. Turpe quid ausurus te sine teste time. Virg. Æn.* 6. *Ausi omnes immane nefas, ausoque potiti*

Fido] Hence *fisus*, and *confisus*, used by *Cic. in Tusc.* 4. *Fiducia, id est firma animi confisio, scientia quædam est.* So *confisus. Cic. pro Rosc. Comæd. Copia & facultate causa confisus.*

Gaudeo] Hence *Gavisus* in *Ter. Heaut.* 4. 8. *Vah, frustra igitur gavisus miser, Cic. Fam.* 8. 14. *Nunc furit tam gavisos homines suum dolorem.*

Gradior] Hence *gressus* the participle, *Virg.* 6. *Æn.*

pariter

Pariter gressi per opaca viarum. So *gressius* the verbal. *Ovid.* 3. *Met. Subsequitur pressoque legit vestigia gressu.*

Disto] Hence is *distito* a frequentative in *Gouldman.*

Irascor] Hence *iratus. Cic. pro Cæl. Huic homini deos plerique iratos putabant. Cic. Att.* l. 15. *Antonio est enim fortasse iratior. Id. Phil.* 8. *Illis fuerat iratissimus. Colum.* 7. 18. *Nonnunquam etiam conservos iratius contueantur.*

Misereor] Hence *Plaut. Trin.* 2. 4. *Me ejus miseritum est. Stephanus* reads it *misertum est. Ter. Phor.* 3. 2. *Miseritum est.*

Metor] Hence *mensue, mensor, mensura. Cato. r. r. Modio alcareo mensum dato C.* 2. *de N. Deor. Spatia mensa quia, conficiunt cursus lunæ, menses vocantur. Colum.* 6. 1. *Quod ego non agricolæ, sed mensoris officium esse dicebam.*

Nanciscor] Hence *nactus Plaut. Capt.* 2. *Valentiorem nactus adversarium.*

Nitor] Hence *nisus* and *nixus. Cic.* 2. *Tusc. Pedetentim, inquit, ite, & sedato nisu. Cic. pro Cluent. Sicut vestrâ æquitate nixi confidimus. A. Gell.* l. 12. 1. *Quam laboriosi nixus fuissent.*

Nascor] Hence *natus* the Substantive. *Virg.* 1. *Æn. Nate patris summi.* So *natus* the Participle. *Cic.* 7. *Verr. Natus genere nobili.* So *natus* the Adjective. *Cic. pro Sestio. Vir. ad dignitatem & ad gloriam natus.* And *natio* both for a Country, and for a Family.

Neo] Hence *netus* the Participle *twisted*; and *netus* or *netum* the Substantive, a *Net*; also *netorius* of Spinning or Netting in *Gouldman.*

Obliviscor] Hence *oblitus. Hor.* 1. *Ep.* 11. *Oblitusq; meorum, obliviscendus & illis.*

Operior] Hence *opertus. Cic. de Sen. Nullo imbre, nullo frigore adduci, ut capite operto sit.*

Ordior] Hence *orsus* the Participle. *Virg.* 1. *Æn. Veneris contrà sic filius orsus.* Also the Substantive Verbal. *Cic.* 2. *de Div. Scire ratosne habeant, an vanos pectoris orsus Virg.* 12. *Æn. Sic ore vicissim Orsa refert.*

Orior] Hence *ortus* the Participle *Cic. Att.* l. 11. *Ortus rumor ex ſulpitii literis.* The verbal Subſtant. *Cic.* 1. *Offic. Ortus noſtri partem patria vendicat.* The participle *oriturus Hor.* 2. *Ep.* 1. *Nil oriturum aliàs, nil ortum tale fatentes.*

Paciſcor] Hence *pactus* the participle. *Cic.* 1. *Off. Cum triginta dierum eſſent cum hoſte pactæ induciæ, nocte populabatur agros.* The Subſtantive verbal *pactum. Ovid. Ep.* 9. *Nec mihi crediderim, recitetur formula pacti.* And *pactio. Cic.* 2. *de Invent. Quum omnes periturі milites eſſent, niſi ad pactionem veniſſent.*

Proficiſcor] Hence *profectus* the Participle. *Cic. de Sen. Adoleſcentulus miles profectus ſum ad Capuam.* And the Verbal *profectio. Cic.* l. 3. *ad Qu. Fr. Recordere conſilium noſtrum, quod fuerit profectionis noſtræ.*

Patior] Hence the Participle *paſſus. Virg.* 1. *Æn. O paſſi graviora, dabit deus his quoque finem.* And *paſſurus, Stat.* 3. *Theb. Situm indignum paſſurus.*

Depango] Hence *depactus. Plin.* l. 2. c. 96. *Depacta in terram non extrahantur.* So from *circumpango* is *circumpactus. Plin.* l. 17. c. 13. *Ramis terra circumpactis.* And though I meet not with the like of *oppango*, and *repango*, yet *Stephanus* gives them *oppactum* and *repactum* for their Supines.

Queror] Hence the participle *queſtus. Ovid. ad Liviam. Oraque nequicquam per modò queſta fluunt. Cic. Fam.* l. 1. *Ep.* 9. *Quid multa? queſtus eſt graviter.* So *queſtus* the verbal Subſtantive. *Virg. Æn.* 4. *Tantos illa ſuo rumpebat pectore queſtus.*

Reor] Hence comes *ratus* the Participle. *Tacit.* l. 18. *Ipſe abunde ratus, ſi præſentibus frueretur.* And the Adjective verbal. *Cic.* 5. *Tuſc. Quorum vagi motus, rata tamen & certa ſui curſus ſpatia deſiuunt. Cic.* 1. *Tuſc. Omnia iſta perinde ut cuique data ſunt, pro ratâ partea vita longa, aut brevia dicuntur.*

Soleo] From hence comes *ſolitus. Ovid* 6. *Met. Solito finem impoſuere labori. Id.* 14. *Met. Velocius ſolito curreo*

Tædet

Tædet] Hence *pertæsum eſt*. *Virg. Æn.* 4. *Si non pertæſum thalami tedæque fuiſſet*. And *pertæſus*. *Suet. Cæſ.* c. 7. *Et quaſi pertæſus ignaviam ſuam, quod nihil dum a ſe memorabile actum eſſet.*

ulciſcor] Thence comes *ultus*. *Ter. Phor.* 1. 4. *Rectè ego mihi vid ſſem, & ſenis eſſem ultus iracundiam*. So *ultio*. *Plin.* l. 11. c. 28. *Illis enim ultionis cauſâ datum eſt*. *Tacit.* l. 2. *Simul perfidos & raptores pacis ultioni & gloriæ mactandos*. So *ultor*, and *ultrix*.

utor] Hence the Participle *uſus*. *Plin. Ep.* 25. *Uſus eſt firmâ valetudine, niſi quod ſolebant ei manus tremere*. So the Subſtantive *uſus*. *Cic.* pro *Rab. Poſth. uſus eſt magiſter optimus*. *Id.* l. 1. *de Orat. Adjungatur uſus frequens, qui omnium magiſtrorum præcepta ſuperat*. The Participle *uſurus*. Whence *Ovid. Met.* 11. *Malè uſurus donis*. And the verbal *uſio A. Gell.* l. 4. c. 1. *Longæ uſionis gratiâ contrahuntur, & retonduntur.*

Qu. Have you yet any thing more to add touching verbs that want their Supines?

An. There is this yet further to be added, that all thoſe verbs do want Supines, who want preterperfect tenſes.

¶ *Præterito quæcunque carent carent atque Supino. Dunef.*

And thus far of the Leſſer Defectives.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVII.

Qu. Whether doth the Grammar give any Rule in verse, touching the greater Defectives?

An. in regard that, what was to be said touching the greater Defectives, was such as would not stand in verse, nor was capable of being comprehended under any Rule; therefore the Authour of this part of the Grammar gives no Rule either in Verse or Prose for them, but delivers what he had to say of the Particular Verbs themselves, in prose: So he

De Verbis Defectivis.

Sed nunc ut totum percurras ordine verbum,
Istis pausa dabis mutilata & anomala verba:
Quæ quia claudæ quidem remanent nec versibus aptæ,
Qui rectis pedibus plerisque incedere gaudent,
Hiscte sequens dabitur quem cernis sermo solutus.

Qu. How many verbs Defectives doth the Grammar treat of?

An. The Defective verbs which the Grammar treats of are Fifteen, *viz. Aio, ausim, salve, ave, cedo, faxo, forem, quæso, infit, inquio, vale, odi, cœpi, memini, novi.*

Qu. What Moods or Tenses, Numbers, or Persons, &c. is *Aio* delivered to have?

An. Aio is delivered to have these Moods, Tenses Numbers, and Persons, &c. following.

Præsens Indicativi aio, ais, ait. Pluraliter *aiunt*
Præteritum imperfectum, aiebam, aiebas, aiebat, Plur. *aiebamus aiebatis, aiebant.*

Imperativus ai. Præsens Optativi, Potentialis, & Subjunctivi Aim, aias. Plur. *aiamus, aiant. Præs. Particip. Aiens.*

Aio

¶ *Aio* is in *Cic. de Div. Aio te Aacida Romanos vincere poſſe. Aiebam* is alſo there read. *Quid ergo Aius iſte, quando eum nemo norat, aiebat, & loquebatur?* For *aiebant*, the ancients ſaid *aibant. Aiat* is in *Tull. de Fin. Quaſi ego curem quid ille aiat, aut neget. Aiens* in *Tull. Topic. Negantia aientibus contraria. Probus* owns *ai, aiſti, ait* in the preterperfect tenſe. In *Tertul.* is read *aierunt. Atque ita omnes aierunt Fiat voluntas domini.* So he *lib. de fug.* And *Voſſius* thinks the Ancients uſed yet more, as *aitis, aite*, which when they appear, may as well be uſed as others, for ought I know. *Voſſ. Etymolog. Lat.* p. 132. *Analog.* l. 3. c. 40.

Qu. **what hath** auſim?

An. Auſim hath theſe following, *Præſens, Optativi & Subjunctivi auſim, auſis, auſit*, Plur. *auſint.*

¶ *Auſim* is uſed for *audeam*, and *auſus ſim* So *Liv.* l. 37. c. 53. *Ego nullt non auſim me comparare.* And it is made by a *Syncope* of *auſerim* formed from *auſi*, which anciently, as we have ſhewed, was the preterperfect of *audeo*, though now *auſus ſum* be onely in uſe.

Qu. **what hath** ſalve?

An. Salve hath theſe following, *Futur. Indicat. ſalvebis. Imper. ſalve, ſalveto.* Plur. *ſalvete, ſalvetote. Infinit. ſalvere.*

¶ *Salvebis* is in *Cic. Att.* l. 6. *Salvebis a meo Cicerone.* i. e. *Cicero meus te ſalutat*, ſaith *Stephanus. Plaut. True.* 2, 2. ſ. 2. hath *ſalveo.* As *ſalve St. Satis mihi eſt tuæ ſalutis. Nihil moror, non ſalveo. Ægrotare malim, quàm eſſe tua ſalute ſanior.* But that is ſpoken in the perſon of a ruſtick, and ſo not to be ſpoken unleſs perhaps in the perſon of ſuch.

Qu. **what hath** aves?

An. Ave hath theſe following: Imperat. *ave, aveto.* Plur. *avete, avetote.* Infin. *avere.*

Ave conſidered as a word of ſalutation hath what the

the Grammar delivers of it. *Ave* is ordinary. *Martial.* 1. 51. *Et matutinum portat ineptus ave. Catull.* 96. *Atque in perpetuum frater ave atque vale. Aveto* is in *Sall. Catilin. Per liberos tuos rogatus aveto. Avere* in *Martial.* l. 3. Ep. 5. —*Hoc dices, Marcus avere jubet.* But *aveo* to desire or covet, hath more tenses. Thence *Cic. Att.* l. 1. *Valde aveo scire, quid agas. Hor.* 1. *Serm. Sat.* 4. *E quibus unus avet quavis aspergere cunctos. Cic.* 1. *Off. Avemus aliquid audire & discere. Id.* 4. *de Fin.* --*avent audire. Id. Attic. Avere te scribis accipere aliquid a me literarum. Hor.* 2. *Serm. Sat.* 4. —*Non est mihi tempus aventi Ponere signa novis præceptis.*

Q. **What hath** cedo?

An. Cedo hath these following: Imperat. *Cedo*; Plur. *Cedite, id est, Dic, vel porrige, Dicite vel porrigite.*

¶ *Cedo* is used for *Dic.* in *Ter. Heaut.* 4. 2. *Nomen mulieris cedo quod sit.* So *Cic.* 7. *Verr. unum cedo auspicem tui facti.* For *porrige*, in *Ter. Hec.* 4. 4. *Puerum mihi cedo. Plaut. Mostell.* 1. 3. *cedo aquam manibus puer. Ter. Heaut.* 3. 1. *Cedo dextram.* Of *cedite* I do not for the present think of, or find any example: Only of *cette* made of and used for *cedite*, there are examples. *Plaut.* in *Mercat.* ac. 5. sc. 4. v. 4. hath it, *uxor tibi placida & placata est, cette dextras nunc jam.* So *Ennius* in *Medea*, *Cette manus vestras, meaque accipite.* Perhaps *cedite* many not be in use, and that may be some reason why *Cicero* as *Stephanus* observes in his *Orat. pro Sepio*, useth *Cedo* in the plural number. *Cedo nunc ejusdem illius inimici mei de me eodem ad verum populum in Campo Martio concionem quis* &c. i. e. *date, vel quæro & exoptato a vobis*, saith *Stephanus.* See *Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 40.

Q. **What hath** faxo?

An. Faxo hath, *Futurum faxo vel faxim, faxis, faxit, pro faciam vel fecero.* Plural *faxint.*

The

¶ The Ancients did often retain the vowel of the prelent tenſe in the preterperfect tenſe, whence *canuere* in *Salluſt* for *cecinere*: and thence ſome future tenſes came to be uttered in *axo*: Hence *axo* for *egero*; for of *ago* was firſt formed *agi*, thence by caſting out *e*, and turning *r* into *s* was *agſi*, or *axi* and thence *axo*, and the compound *adaxo*: and ſo of *facio* firſt was formed *faci*, thence *facero*, and of that by caſting out *e*, and turning *r* into *s*, was made *faſo* or *faxo*. And ſo of *agerim* and *facerim* by the like change, was made *axim*, (and *adaxim* the compound of it) and *faxim*. The former of theſe *axim*, *Attius* in *Peribœâ* hath, *ut quæ egi ago, vel axim, verruncent bene*: as *Plaut.* hath *adxim* the compound of it in his *Aul.* 1. 1. *utinam me divi adaxint ad ſuſſendium*; the latter, *faxim. Ter.* in *Ad.* 5. 5. *Tibi lubens benefaxim.* So *Plaut. Amph.* 1. 3. *Ego faxim te Amphitruonem eſſe malis, quàm Jovem. Id. Pſeud.* 1. 1. *Ex tabellis jam faxo ſcies. Pœn* 1. 1. *utrumque faxo habebit. Id. Capt.* 1. 2. *Si faxis, te in caveam dabo. Id. Capt.* 3. 5. *Abſcede ab iſta obſecro, ne quid in te male faxit irâ percita. Id. Truc.* 1. 1. *Quos cum celamus, ſi faximus conſcios. Id. Capt.* 1. 2. *Ita di deæque faxint. Plaut. Pſeud.* 1. 5. hath *faxem* for *feciſſem*. *Piſtrinum in mundo ſcibam, ſi id faxem* (i. e. *feceſſem*) *mihi. Voſſius* ſaith *Faxitis* is read in *carmine antiquo devotionis Urbium atque exercituum.* And in *Shirley* there is read *faxere* for *facturum eſſe*, in his *Via ad Latin. Ling. Complanat.* p. 99. See *Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 41.

Q. What hath forem?

An. Forem hath *Imperfectum Optat. Poten. & Subjunct. Forem, fores, foret, pro eſſem, eſſes, eſſet.* Plur. *forent. Infinit. fore, id eſt, futurum eſſe.*

¶ *Forem* is made of *fuerem*, as *fore* of *fuere*, from the old verb *fuo. Ter. Hec.* 4. 1. hath it. *Nam ſi uxorem vis horum mulier, nunquam tibi viſus forem.* The compound thereof *afforem*, is in *Virg. Æn.* 1. *Atque utinam*

tinam rex ipse Noto ampulsus eodem Afforet. So *confore* is in *Ter. And.* 1. 1. *Et spero confore. Voss.* in his *Etymolog. Lat.* p. 133. hath also *deforem*, but without an Authour: yet *Stephanus* for *defore*, cites both *Cicero* and *Silius*. *Verùm arbitrabantur non defore, qui illa restituerent.* So the former *Contr. Rull. Promittitque viris nulli se defore testem* so the latter. *Fore* the simple, *Plaut.* hath *Amph.* 1. 2. *Confide fore.* See *Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 41.

Qu. **What hath** quæso?

An. Quæso hath *Præsens, Indicat. Quæso.* Plural. *Quæsumus.*

¶ *Lucret.* l. 5. hath *quæsit. Non divûm pacem votis adit, ac prece quæ sit. Plaut. in Menæch.* 5. 1. v. 36. hath *quæse*, as *Colvius* reads it, *I, Decio, quæse meum patrem*; but that is now read *quære*. But *Plaut.* hath *quæsere* in *Bacch.* 2. 2. 1. *Mirum est me ut redeam te opere tanto quesere.* i. e. *rogare, orare.* And *Appuleius* l. 4. hath *quæsens. Multis nos affatibus multisque precibus quesens adhortatur. Voss. Anal* l. 3. c. 41.

Qu. **What hath** infit?

An. Infit (as our Authour saith) *sola vox est, dicet, seu dixit significans.* Plur. *Infiunt, id est, dicunt.*

¶ *Infit* comes of *infio* used by *Varro* as *Priscian.* l. 8. testifies. And it signifies the same that *cœpit*, or *incipit*, as *Festus* expounds it. Thence *Plaut. Aulul.* 2. 4. *Infit ibi postulare, plorans, ejulans*, &c. So *Virg. Æn.* 11. *Ita furier infit. Lucret.* l. 3. *Commutare animum quicunque adoritur & infit. Virg. Æn.* 12. v. 10. *Tunc sic affatur regem, atque ita turbidus infit.* Besides our Authour; many imagine that it signifies also, *inquit ac ait*, &c. And to this purpose *Stephanus* from *Budæus* cites *Liv.* l. 1. *ab urbe. Tum ita Tullus infit, Romani si unquam ante alias ullo in bello fuit, quod*, &c. *Id.* 1. *ab urbe. Infit annum se tertium & non agesimum agere*: and also adds out of *Virg. Æn.* 10. *Tum pater omnipotens rerum cui summa potestas Infit, eo dicente deûm domus alta silescit.*

fleſcit. So *Virg. Æn.* 5. *Iſque his Æneam ſolatus vocibus infit. Id. Æn.* 10. *–alloquitur merentem & talibus infit.* But in theſe or the like, in the opinion of *Voſſius* there is *loqui* or *fari* underſtood, which is expreſſed in that of *Virgil* above named. *Ita farier inſit.* See *Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 40. *Danef. Schol.* l. 1. c. 25. Hither may be referred *diſit* for *deeſt, deſiunt, deſit, deſieri. Ter. Eun.* 2. 2. *Nihil quum eſt, nihil deſit tamen. Virg. Ecl.* 2. *Lac mihi non æſtate novum, non frigore diſit. Gell. Quæ creſcente luna gliſcunt, diſciente, contra luna deſiunt. Plaut. Rud.* 4. 4. *Omnia iterum vis memorari ſcelus, ut deſiat dies. Id. Menæch.* 1. 4. *Tritus vide quid ſit ſatis, neque deſiat, neque ſuperſit. Ter. Hec.* 5. 2. *Nihil apud me tibi deſieri patiar.* So *conſit, conſiat, conſieret, conſieri. Ter. Adelph.* 5. 8. *Hoc conſit quod volo. Colum.* l. 8. *Sic enim curabit ut & panis diligenter conſias. Cic. Att.* l. 9. *--Quo facilius --res tota conſieret. Cæſ.* 7. *Bell. Gall. Poſtquam id difficilius conſieri animadvertit.*

Qu. **What hath** inquio?

An. Inquio hath theſe, *Præſens Indicativi, inquio vel inquam, inquis, inquit.* Plur. *Inquimus, inquiunt. Præterperfectum inquiſti, inquit. Futurum, Inquies, inquiet. Præſens Optativi, Potentialis & Subjunctivi, Inquiat. Particip. Inquiens.*

¶ *Inquio* is very little, if at all uſed. That of *Cicero* 2. *de Orat. Aucupari verba oportebit inquio*, produced for it, is found to be a corrupted place, *inquio* there being put for *in quo.* That of *Catullus, Volo ad Serapin Feivi mane mane, inquio puellæ*, is a little better thought of; though not without ſuſpicion; So that *Regius Lepidus* reads it *inquam*, and *Scaliger inquii.* It may be beſt therefore to leave *Priſcian* in this, and follow *Diomedes* and *Phocas* who diſallowed of it. But *inquam* made, as *Voſſius* thinks, by a *Syncope* of *inquiebam* (ſo that at firſt it was of the preterimperfect tenſe though now it be of the preſent tenſe) is more uſual. *Cic. Ver.* 7.

Grum.

Crux, crux inquam infelici ac misero Id. pro Rab Posth. Vos, vos inquam & senatus frequens restitit. So *inquis* is in *Cic.* 1. *Phil. Quas tu mihi interceſſiones inquis?* So *Perſ.* 1. *Sat. Hic inquis veto quiſquam faxit oletum.* Alſo *inquit* in *Cic. ad Att. En, inquit mihi hæc ego pa-tior quotidie. Inquimus* is in *Hor. Sat.* 3. l. 1. *Communi ſenſu plane caret inquimus.* Yea and *inquitis* is in *Arnob.* l. 1. *Sed antiquiora inquitis, noſtra ſunt. Id.* l. 2. *Non credimus, inquitis, vera eſſe, quæ dicit. Inquiunt, Cicero in Verr.* 6. hath, *Ubi ſunt Pamphile, inquiunt, Scyphi? Inquiebant* is (as *Voſſius* ſaith) *ipſius Ciceronis*, but where he names not. *Nizolius* quotes *Cicero*'s Topics for *inquiebat.* And there indeed I find, *Nihil hoc ad jus, ad Ciceronem inquibat Gallus noſter--* in *Lambine*'s Edition, which perhaps in others is *inquiebat. Inquiſti, Cicero* hath in his 2. *de Orat. Tu verò inquiſti moleſtus non eris. Inquies Cic. in Fam.* ep. hath, *ubi igitur inquies Philoſophia tua? Inquiet* he hath in *Verr. Ergo inquiet aliquis.* So in his *ad Herenn. Quid amor? inquiet quiſpiam-- Inque* is in *Ter. Heaut.* 4. 7. 1. *Eccam me inque. Id. Phorm.* 5. 7. 26. *Tum autem Antiphonem video ab ſe amittere Invitum eam, inque.* Alſo in *Plaut. Pſeud.* 1. 5. 124. *Jus bonum erat Pſeudolus. Dabo inque. Inquito* in *Plaut. Aulul.* 4. 10. 58. *Bene ſeliciterque vertat; ità Di faxint inquito.* But of any other tenſes or perſons of this verb, as yet I meet with nothing in Authours. When ought appears, 'tis reaſon it ſhould be admitted of.

Qu. **What hath** vale?

An. Vale hath *Indicat. Valebis. Imper. Vale valeto Plur. Valetote. Infin. valere.*

¶ *Valebis* and *valere* is in *Cic.* l. 6. *Ad Attic. Valebis igitur, & valere Piliam, & Cæciliam noſtram jubebis literis, & ſalvebis a meo Ciceron. Vale in Cic. Fam.* 16. 10. *Etiam atque etiam vale* and at the end of almoſt every Ep. in *Cicero. Vale comes* in *Plaut. Capt* 3. 5. together with *ſalve. Vale atque ſalve, etſi*

aliter

aliter ut dicam meres. Id. curc. 4. 2. *Vale atque salve.* And so in *Ciſtell.* 1. 1. 118. *Bach.* 4. 9. 11. So in *Cic. Fam.* 16. 5. *Vale, mitiro, vale, vale, & ſalve.* So *Ib. Ep.* 9. *vale, ſalve.* Betwixt which two we may note that diſtinction given by *Suetonius* in *Galba. Exoletum morem, tantum in domo ſuâ hærentem obſtinatiſſimè retinuit, ut liberti, ſervique bis die frequentes adeſſent, ac mane ſalvere, veſperi valere ſibi ſinguli dicerent. Valete* is the concluſion of *Cicero's Ep.* 76. l. 13. *Fam.* So. l. 19. *Ep.* 1. *Tulliolæ & Ciceroni ſalutem dic. Valete.* So *ib. Ep.* 4. Thus it is with this word when uſed as a term of Valediction, or bidding Farewel. But when it ſignifies *poſſum, polleo, potens ſum, vim habeo, vires habeo, momentum vel pondus, vel autoritatem habeo, alicujus momenti putor, operor, proficio, momentum affero,* as *Nizolius* gleaneth it, ſo it is no defective but a perfect verb.

Qu. What hath odi?

An. Odi hath the preterperfect tenſe, and moſt, if not all thoſe, that come of it, Viz. *odi, oderam, &c.*

¶ *Odi* is in *Hor.* 3. *Carm. Od.* 1. *Odi profanum vulgus & arceo. Cic. in Off.* hath, *Quem quiſque odit, periiſſe expetit. Horat. Virtutem præſentem odimus. Cic. Att. Nec enim Appium odimus, & Brutum amamus. Cic.* in *Offic. Quem metuunt oderunt. M. Anton.* in his Letter recited by *Cic. Phil.* 13. hath *odivit. Nec deſeram partes quas Pompeius odivit.* But that is not uſed. *Cic. Attic. Non dubito quin me male oderit. Catull. Epigr.* 14. *Odiſſem te odio Vatiniano. Cic. Fam. Pati contumelias pejus odero malis omnibus aliis. Id. de Am. Apertè vel odiſſe magis ingenuum eſt, quàm fronte occultare ſententiam. Id. ib. Ita amare oportet ut aliquando ſis oſurus.* The Future Tenſe of the Subjunctive Mood of this Verb is uſed for the Imperative, as in *Cic.* 1. *Philip. Oderint dum metuant.* And ſo it is in *cœpero* and *meminero.* For *odi* ſome have alſo ſaid *oſus ſum,*

So *Plaut. Amphitr.* 3. 2. 19. *Inimicos semper ofa sum obtuerier.* So *Gell.* l. 4. c. 8. *Hunc Fabricius non probabat, neque amico utebatur, ofusque cum morem causa fuit.* This Preterperfect *odi*, is from the preſent tenſe *odio*, anciently in uſe in Claſſick Authours, and retained by ſome latter eſpecially Eccleſiaſtick Writers, both in the Active and paſſive form. Thence *Goldaſtus* from the Manuſcript of *Valerian* cites, *Odio conloquium meretricis.* St. *Hier.* hath in his Bible, *odiet, odient, odivi, odite, odientes, &c.* So *Petronius* hath *odientes*, and *Appuleius odiendi. In Proverb.* 1. 2. is read *odibunt ſcientiam. In Eccleſiaſtici* c. 20. ver. 8. *qui poteſtatem ſibi ſumit injuſtè odictur. Tertull. adv. Gent.* hath, *oditur itaque in hominibus innocuis etiam nomen innocuum ib. At enim ſecta oditur in nomine utique ſui autoris.* 'Tis beſt to uſe but what is uſual. See *Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 39. *Saturn.* l. 6. c. 5.

Qu. **What hath** cœpi?

An. Cœpi hath the preterperfect and thoſe that come of it, *cœpi, cœperam, &c.* Thence in *Ovid.* 1. *Amor. Eleg.* 7. *Sentive cœpi me nocentem eſſe. Ter. Ad.* 2. 1. *Illuc quæſo redi, quo cœpiſti. Id.* 3. 3. *Priùs olfeciſſem, quàm ille quicquam cœperit. Cic. de Fato. Neve inde navis inchoandæ exordium cœpiſſet. Cic. Att. Cajetam ſi quando abundave cœpero, omnibo. Cic. pro Rab. Poſth. ut magis pœniteret cœpiſſe, quàm licere deſiſtere, &c.* For *Cœpi* ſome have uſed *cœptus ſum. Cic. de Cl. Orat. Qua in urbe primùm literis oratio mandari cœpta eſt. Id.* 1. *Cat. Nunc de repub. conſuli cœpti ſumus. Liv.* l. 3. *Contemni cœpti erant a finitimis populis. Cæl. Ciceroni. De damnatione frequenter loqui eſt cœptum. Cic. Att.* l. 16. *Prior mihi legi cœpta eſt. Cic. de Cl. Orat. Hortenſius igitur cum admodum adoleſcens eſſet in foro ad cere, celeriter ad majores cauſſas adhiberi cœptus eſt. Ib. Is cum ſatis floruiſſet adoleſcens, minor haberi eſt cœptus poſtea.* Of the preſent tenſe *cœpio* alſo, or the tenſes derived from it, there may be

read

read examples. Thence *Plaut. Menæch.* 5. 5. *Neque egoinſanio, neque ego pugnas, neque lites cœpio. Cæcilius in Peribœa* hath *Aere obſcuro hercle deſinam, Mane cœpiam. Feſtus* alſo quotes from *Cato. Cœpiam ſeditioſa verba loqui. Plaut. Truc.* 2. 1. *ubi nihil habeat, alium quæſtum cœpiat. Ter. Adelph.* 3. 4. *Non ſex totis menſibus prius olfeciſſem, quàm ille quicquam cœperet?* Others read *cœperit. Plaut. Perſ.* 1. 3. 41. *Lubido extemplo eſt cœpere convivium.*

Q. **What hath** memini?

An. Memini hath the tenſes, that come of the preterperfect tenſe, and is defective in the preſent tenſe, and thoſe that come of it, but that in the Imperative it hath Sing. *Memento.* Plur. *mementote*, as our Authour notes.

¶ *Plaut. Curc.* 3. v. 14. *Nil tu me ſatiùm monueris memini & ſcio. Cic. de Senect. Omnia quæ curant ſenes meminerunt. Cic. in Philip. Meminiſti ipſe de exulibus. Id. Ep. Fam. Meminiſtis me ita diſtribuiſſe, cauſam. Plaut. Truc.* 2. 1. *Nos divitem eum meminimus, atque iſte paupere nos. Plin.* l. 8. c. 40. *Itinera quamvis longa meminere. Quintil.* l. 11. c. 2. *Neque omnino hujus rei meminit uſquam poeta ipſe. Cic. Ver.* 4. *Ipſe ſui meminerat æque. Plaut. Aulul.* 3. 6. *Meminerint ſeſe unde oriundi ſient. Cic. de Amic. Quæ diſputata ab eo meminiſſet Scævola. Cic. Fam. Ep. Te rogo ut memineris. Id. pro Quinct. Si hæc memineritis. Plaut. Capt.* 2. 1. 52. *Qui nunc ſis meminiſſe ut memineris. Plaut. Aſin.* 5. 2. 89. *De palla memento amabo. Cic. in Philip. Sed memento præter Appium neminem eſſe, &c. Memini* as *Voſſius* and *Stephanus* obſerve, comes of the old verb *meno*, whence by a reduplication, after the manner of the Greeks, comes *memini*, as of *fallo, fefelli.* Though there was alſo read *memino*, whence the participle *meminens*, whereof *Voſſius* produceth many examples. *Auſon in tumulo Minervii Rhetoris. Vivis adhuc ævi, quod ſupereſt meminens. Sidon. Apollinar.* l. 6. Ep. 3. *Mei meminens non ſum.* both

which yet *meno*, and *memino* are now out of use. See *Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 39.

Qu. What hath novi?

An. Novi, thought to want the present tense, because (like *odi* and *memini*) in the preterperfect tense it sometime hath the signification of the present tense, yet is not defective in that tense: but hath the present tense, and those that come of it, and so may pass for a perfect verb.

¶ That *odi* hath the signification of the present tense is evident from that fore-mentioned place of *Cicero*, *Servire & contumelias pati pejus odi malis omnibus aliis*. And so from infinite places more. The like for *memini* appears from that of *Cic. pro Planc. Memini enim memini, nec unquam oblivisco nec tis illius.* So *Flor.* 1. 12. *Hoc tunc Veientes fuere, nunc fuisse quis memini.* Whether the same may be said for *cœpi* I know not. Mr. *Farnaby* saith the same in this respect of it, as of *odi* and *memini*, which is a good presumption it is so, though *Rhenius* say, *habet significationem tantum praeteriti, excepto futuro conjunctivi cœpero*: But for *novi* it may be said. So it is used by *Ter. Adelph.* 4. *v.* 33. *Nomen nescio illius hominis, sed locum novi ubi sit. ib.* 38. *illic ubi etiam caprificus magna est. nostin' Novi.* And in a thousand places more. Yet that it hath the present tense and those formed from it, is most evident. Thence *Cic. ad Attic. Ego verò causas tuas nosco. Stat.* l. 1 *Silv. Nosco diem causasque jacti. Cic. de N. Deor. Deus ille quem mente noscimus. —Id. in Verr. Tutores hic noscunt. Ovid.* 1. *Trist.* 4. *El. Nec noscitur ulli—Cic. De N. Deor. Omnes Philosophiae partes tum noscuntur, cum totæ quæstiones scribendo explicantur. Tacit.* l. 18. *Scribonianus a domino noscebatur. Plaut. Amph Verùm actutum noscas inquam, illum servum Sosiam. Cic. Tusc Cum igitur, nosce te dicit, hoc dicit, nosce animum tuum. Plaut. Pœn.* 4. 2. *Fac ergo id facias nostram, ut ille possit noscere. Cic. de Leg. Atqui*

vereor,

vereor, ne iſtam cauſam nemo noſcat. Id. ib. Sapientia nos cum cæteras res omnes, tum quod eſt difficillimum docuit, ut noſmetipſos noſceremus. A. Gell. l. 11. *Pyrrhonii indicia rei cujuſque negant poſſe noſci & percipi.* Whereupon we may well with *Saturnius* (l. 1. c. 21.) conclude noſco to be a perfect verb.

Qu. **Can you name any more Defective Verbs of this ſort, beſide what our Authour here mentions?**

An. There are ſome few verbs more mentioned by Grammarians, which for the greatneſs of their Defects, may be added hither, ſuch as *Ovat*, *explicit*, *apage*.

Qu. **What hath** ovat?

An. Ovat is ſaid to have *ovat, ovarent, ovandi, ovans.*

¶ *Ovat* is read in *Valer.* 4. *Argonaut. Lætus ovat. Ovans* in *Plaut. Bacchid.* 4. 9. *Mihi evenit, ut ovans prædâ onuſtus incederem. Ovarent* and *ovandi* are named by Mr. *Shirley* in his *Via ad Latin. Ling. complanata*, p. 92. without Authour, yet I ſuppoſe, not without good Authority. And from whence, but *ovatum* a Supine of this verb, can come the verbals *ovatus*, and *ovatio*; yet Mr. *Farnaby* ſaith, *ovat & Particip. ovans tantùm in uſu ſunt. Syſtem. Gram.* p. 42.

Qu. **What hath** explicit?

An. Explicit hath Ind. Preſ. *explicit.* Plur. *Explicitunt.*

¶ *Explicit* ſignifies the ſame that *definit.* I find it in Mr. *Shirley's* Gram. Lat. pag. 39. and *Gouldman's* Dictionary.

Qu. **What hath** apage?

An. Apage hath Imper. *apage* Plur. *apagite.*

¶ This word is ſometimes uſed abſolutely, ſometimes it hath a Caſe after it. Thence ſome will have it a *Verb*, ſome an *Adverb*, and ſome an *Interjection*, as *Stephanus* notes. The three beſt of Modern Grammarians, that I have met with, *Voſſius*, *Rhenius* and *Farnaby*

naby deliver it for a verb, derived from the Greek ἄπαγε, ἀπάγετε of ἀπάγω *abigo*. It is used without a Case by *Plaut. Amphit.* 1. 1. 154. *Apage. Non places me hoc noctis esse, cœnavi modò.* With a Case. *Plaut. Trin.* 2. 1. 25. *Apage te, Amor non places, nihil te utor.* So *Ter. Eun.* 5. 2. 65. *Neque pol servandum tibi Quidquam dare ausim; neque te servare: apage te. Vic. Fam.* 5. 10. *Apage te cum nostro Sex. Et servitio: nam me hercule ego illum quoque amo. Plaut. Amph.* 2. 1. 32. *Vah! apage te a me. Id. Merc.* 1. 1. 33. *Apage istiusmodi salutem, cum cruciatu quæ advenit. Id. Curc.* 5. 1. 8. *Apage istanc caniculam.* And what is said of *apage*, may be said of *age*, which is used sometimes verbally, sometime adverbally, with *dum* annexed to it; and without it, as *age agedum, agite agitedum*, with this observation only, that *agite*, and *agitedum* have alwaies a plural with them. Whereof see *Farnab. System. Gram.* p. 42. *Voss. Etymolog. Latin.* p. 132. *Rhenius.* p. 245.

FINIS.

Errata in *As in Præsenti.*

PAge 259. Line 22. read *lavĕre.* p. 266. l. 24. r. *cubui.* p. 267. l. 5. r. *accubitionem.* p. 269. l. 24. r. *beo, ceo.* p. 274. l. 7. r. *tetegi.* l. 21. r. *oboritur.* l. 25. r. *Phocas.* l. 33. r. *melioribus.* p. 275. l. 8. r. *refrixerit res.* l. 34 r. *Quintilians.* p. 277. l. 16. r. *connixeo.* p. 281. l. 30. r. πάγω l. 34. r. *Tetendi is.* p. 283. l. 28. r. *tetigi.* p. 285. l. 23. r. *ſparſi.* p. 287. l. 8. r. *Jaſz-Berenyi.* l. 9. r. *Servius.* l. 16. r. *Sepulchra.* p. 290. l. 16. r. *this is.* p. 294. l. 15. r. *Daneſius.* p. 295. l. 14. r *Quin. polſi.* p. 300. l. 3. r. *terui.* l. 15. r. *ſtetiſti.* p. 306. l. 33. r. *Proſtibulo.* p. 307. l. 4. r. *ſe cernuum.* p. 308. l. 21. r. *te ſiſti.* p. 315. l. 32. r. *both. its.* p. 321. l. 19. r. *veneo.* p. 323. l. 16. r. *ſanxeris:* p. 328. l. 6. r. *exterritus.* p. 330. r. *tibi. Dinarchus.* p. 332. l. 4. r. *invenirí.* p. 337. l. 5. r. *Craſſum trabes.* p. 347. l. 4. r. *oblæſeris.* l. 20. r. *Sentius occanere.* p. 348. l. 29. r. *tetigi.* p. 349. l. 38. r. *ac ſidera.* p. 353. l. 12. r. *loſſe.* l. 23. r. *compoſed of.* p. 359. l. 12. r. *But elicio.* p. 366. l. 16. r. *geminant ſſ.* p. 367. l. 9. r. *uveſcunt.* p. 370 l. 3. r. *cecidi.* p. 371. l. 1. *tetigi.* p. 372. l. 6. r. *ceculi.* p. 374. l. 13. r. *that thoſe that.* p. 377, l. 17, r. *Maſſo,* l. 18, r. *vetuſtiſſimos,* p. 386, l. 17, r. *torrui,* p. 388, l. 1, r. *altum,* l. 3, r. *inuſitatum,* p. 401, l. 32, r. *ſparſi;* p, 405; l, 18, r, *Dein;* p, 415, l, 23, r, *ſummum;* l, 31, r, *illic;* p, 419, l, 20, r, *pacſcit;* p, 420, l, 36, r, *Marcellin;* p, 422, l, 14, r, παθητικῶς; p, 424, l, 11, r, *Hercule;* p, 426, l, 11, r, *Facundo;* p, 429, l, 20 r, *ovans;* l, 26, r, *continuavce.*

N*. 14. 18

AN

EXPLANATION

Of the RULES of the

ROYAL GRAMMAR:

Touching the *Preterperfect tenses* and *Supines* of *Verbs* as they are delivered in

LILLIE'S RULES,

Commonly called

As in Præsenti, &c.

By way of *Question* and *Answer*, Opening the meanings of the Rules with great plainness to the understanding of Children of meanest capacity.

BIBL. CANT. ACAD.

With choice *Critical Observations* on the same, from the best extant *Authours* and *Grammarians*. For the amending of the *Mistakes*, and supplying of the *Defects* thereof.

By WILLIAM WALKER, B. D.
Authour of the Treatise of the English Particles.

LONDON,
Printed for *Robert Pawlet* at the Sign of the *Bible* in *Chancery Lane* near *Fleet-street*, and *Edward Pawlet* Bookseller in *Grantham*. 1670.

2091:99

To the Right Reverend Father in God, *John* by Divine Providence Lord Bishop of *Rochester*, and Dean of *Westminster*. *William Walker* Rector of *Colsterworth* wisheth all happiness.

My Lord

I *humbly make bold to Dedicate this Volume of* Explanations *of* Lillies Rules *for the* Preterperfect tenses *and* Supines *of* Verbs *to your Lordships* Name *and* Honour. *Many are the reasons inducing me thereunto: whereof it may not be amiss briefly to hint at two or three. And it were enough to claim as great a respect as this from*

me to You, that You *and* I *were once* Scholars together *in the same School of* Lincoln, *under the same Master, and in the same Seat; and so it cannot but become me by some honourable reflection to express that affection towards you, which being begotten in youth, is not lessened by age, but ripened by continuance. But there are more perswading inducements than this by far. Your Lordships great* Eminency *not only for most honourable* Places *in the Church, but also for most noble* Endowments, *and high* Improvements, *worthily recommending You to those Places of honour, do justly challenge from all, that Respect and Honour, and those Remarks and Testimonies thereof, which use to be given*

to Persons of greatest Note for Vertue and Goodness. And therefore it cannot mis-become me, but rather is incumbent as a Duty upon me, to be paying, in such a way as I am able, my due Respects unto your so Eminent Merits. *But over and besides what the desert of your* many *and* great Vertues, *(vertues to be lov'd and admir'd by all, that have in them any true sense of Vertue or Goodness) doth in common challenge from me together with others, there are also* Singular Obligations *unto all respects towards you lying upon me by my self, from several* Particular Favours *and* Kindnesses *done unto me by You. So that all the Honour and Respect I were able any way to put upon You, were it much*

more than I am able, would be no other from me, but the just tribute *of a worthily deserved* Gratitude. *And under that notion as I pay, so I humbly beg of you to accept of this Respect, and withal to pardon this so poor an expression of it. I add not, because I need not add, how welcome an Entertainment,* a Name so lov'd and honour'd as Yours, *standing in the fore-front of my Book will bespeak for it in the breasts of all unbiast Persons. And therefore not to encrease your Lordships trouble any further, I do earnestly desire, that the Lord would long continue your Life and Health, for his own honour and his Churches Service upon Earth, and after Crown you with a blessed immortality, and a glorious Eter-*

nity

nity in the Heavens: and ſo heartily recommending both your Lordſhips Perſon, and Relations, and Concernments unto the Divine Protection, and Benediction, I reſt,

From *Colſterworth December* the 8th. 1669.

My Lord,
Your Honours moſt humble and moſt obliged Servant,

WILLIAM WALKER.

Namque ſuum ſimplex perago ſequitur, ſatagoque
Atque ab ago dego dat degi, cogo coegi.

An. The meaning of that Note or Rule is this; That two of the compounds of *ago* namely *perago*, and *ſatago*, to which we may perhaps add a third *circumago*, do keep the vowel of the ſimple verb: and two of them namely *dego* and *cogo* do change the firſt vowel of it, but not into *i*, but the firſt into *e*, and the ſecond into *o*.

¶ *Circumago* is ordinarily read. *Liv.* l. 1. *ab urbe. Prius quàm circumagerent frenis equos, terga vertunt. Plin.* l. 2. c. 3. *circumagitur orbis* 24. *horarum ſpatio. Hor.* l. 1. *Sat.* 9. *Nil opus eſt te circumagi.*

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

The declining of the words.

An. The words of this Rule, are declined thus:

Perago, peragis, peregi, peragere, peractum.
Satago, ſatagis, ſatigi, ſatagere.
circumago --gis. --egi, --agere, --actum.
Dego, degis, degi, degere.
Cogo, cogis, coegi, coegere, coactum.

Qu. **What is the meaning of that Rule touching ſome compounds of** rego *? Viz.*

A rego ſic pergo.

A rego ſic pergo perrexi, vult quoq. ſurgo
Surrexi mediâ præſentiâ ſyllabâ ademp â.

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That two compounds of *rego*, namely *pergo*, and *ſurgo* do not change *e* into *i*, like the other compounds of it, *erigo, corrigo*, &c. but leave it quite out.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

The declining of the words.

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus:

Rego, regis, rexi, regere, rectum.
Pergo, pergis, perrexi, pergere, perrectum.
Surgo, ſurgis, ſurrexi, ſurgere, ſurrectum.

Qu. **What Rule is there touching the compounds of** facio *?*

An. Touching the compounds of *facio* there is this Rule:

Nil

Nil variat facio, niſi præpoſito præeunte,
Id docet olfacio, cum calfacio, inficioque.

Nil variat facio.

Q. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An The meaning of the Rule is this: That when *facio* is compounded with a prepoſition, the firſt vowel of it is changed into *i*, elſe not.

Therefore we ſay not *olficio*, but *olfacio*, nor *calficio*, but *calfacio*, becauſe thoſe verbs are not compounded with any prepoſition, but with *oleo*. and *calco*, two verbs; and again we ſay *inficio*, and not *infacio*, becauſe that verb is compounded with the prepoſition *in*.

¶ *Olfacio cum calfacio*] So *floccifacio, naucifacio, ſatisfacio, benefacio, malefacio, frigefacio, compendifacio*, and *commonefacio*. Againſt the two laſt words Mr. *Bowles* in his Margine ſets theſe two words [*ex uſu*] with an *aſteriſc* directing to them, as meaning, I imagine, that thoſe words are out of uſe, but if he mean otherwiſe, then I miſapprehend him. The former of them is in *Plaut. Moſtell.* c. 1. 57. *Orationis operam compendifac.* So *Id. Perſ.* 3 5. *Nam ego hodie compendifeci binos panes indies.* The latter is ordinary. *Cic. Fam.* 5. 3. *Is vos doceret, & commonefaceret. Cic.* 4. *Verr. Illi eum commonefaciunt, ut ſi ei videatur, utatur inſtituto ſuo.* So *Sall.* and *Gell.* See *Stephanus* and *Nizolius*. But perhaps that *Aſteriſc* was intended only as a direction to the former of them, and that indeed is not ſo uſual.

Inficioque] So *afficio, conficio, deficio, efficio; interficio, officio, perficio, præficio, proficio, reficio, ſufficio.*

Q. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus: The declining of the words.

Facio, facis, feci, facere, factum.
Olfacio, olfacis, olfeci, olfacere, olfactum.
Calfacio, calfacis, calfeci, calfacere, calfactum.
Inficio, inficis, infeci, inficere, infectum.

Q. **What Rule is there for the compounds of** Lego?

An.

An. for the compounds of *lego* there is this Rule:

A lego nata re, *A lego nata re, se, per, pra, sub trans præeunte*
Præsentis servant vocalem in i cætera mutant.

Qu. What is the meaning of this Rule?

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That some compounds of *lego* do not change the first vowel into *i*, namely those that are compounded with *re*, *per*, *pra*, *sub* and *trans* (whereunto *ad* may also be added) as *relego*, *perlego*, *prælego*, *sublego*, *translego*, and *allego*: but that the rest of the compounds of *lego* do change the first vowel of it into *i*: as *deligo*, *eligo*, *diligo*, *intelligo*, *negligo*, *seligo*.

¶ *Se*] The adding of *Se* amongst the particles, with which when *lego* is compounded, it *changes* not the first vowel into *i*, seems to be a mistake, and it seems also to be noted by some hand setting an *Asterisk* before it. For *seligo* is the usual writing, not *selego*. So *Cic. in Orat. Omnia expendat, & seligat. Ovid. 3. Amor. 3. eleg. Te seligo tantum.* The Teacher, if he pleases may put out *se*, and make up the verse by putting in [*ad*] thus:
A lego nata re, per, pra, sub, trans, ad præeunte.
For *ad* compounded with *lego* makes *allego*, not *alligo*. Thence *Suet. in Tiber. Instanti sæpius, ut civitate donatum in Decurias allegeret, negavit se allecturum*; Perhaps to distinguish it from *alligo* the compound of *ligo*, and so in the rest, where likeness of composition may expose to mistake.

Qu. What is the meaning of that Note annexed to this Rule touching the compounds of lego?

De quibus hæc intelligo. *De quibus hæc intelligo, diligo, negligo tantum,*
Præteritum lexi faciunt; reliqua omnia legi.

An. The meaning of that note is this: That of the compounds of *lego*, three make their Preterperfect tense in *lexi*, viz. *intelligo diligo*, and *negligo*: but all the rest in their Preterperfect tense have *legi*.

De quibus hæc intelligo -- negligo] Anciently these words made *intellegi*, and *neglegi*. So *Diomedes* and

Prisc.

Priſcian tells us, that *Æmil. Macer* ſpake *Omnem noſtrum neglegerit autoritatem.* And M. *Antonie* in *Cic. Phil.* 13. *Theopompum nudum, expulſum a Trebonio, confugere Alexandriam neglegiſtis.* And that *Ulpian* did uſe *intellegerit* for *intellexerit* more than once, is atteſted by *Voſſius de Analog.* l. 3. c. 27. But theſe are now out of uſe.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus: The declining of the words.

Lego, legis, legi. legere, lectum.
Intelligo, intelligis, intellexi, intelligere, intellectum.
Diligo, diligis, dilexi, diligere, dilectum.
Negligo, negligis, neglexi, negligere, neglectum.

And thus far of the Rules for the preterperfect tenſes of verbs as well compound as ſimple.

CHAP IX.

Qu. WE have ſpoken of the Rules for the forming of *Preterperfect tenſes*, and are now to proceed to the Rules for the forming of *Supines*; **Is there any Order obſerved by the Grammar in the treating of theſe things?**

An. In treating of the Rules for the forming of *Supines* the Grammar obſerves this *Order*: *Firſt* it treats of the Supines of *Simple* verbs; And *then* of the Supines of verbs *Compounded.*

Qu. **What** General **Rule have you for the forming of the Supines of ſimple verbs?**

An. For the forming of the Supines of ſimple verbs we have this Rule.

De Simplicium Verborum Supinis.

Nunc ex Præterito diſcas formare Supinum. *Nunc ex Præterito.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That the *Su-*

Supines of *simple* verbs, are formed from their *Preterperfect tenses* according to the directions given in the particular rules hereafter following; wherein from the termination of the *Preterperfect tense* we are taught how to form the *Supine*, and that according to the order of the Alphabet, beginning with *bi*, and going on to *ci*, *di*, *gi*, *li*, *mi*, *ni*, *pi*, *qui*, *ri*, *si*, *psi*, *ti*, *vi*, *ui*, *xi*.

Qu. **what is the Rule for the forming of the** Supine, **from those preterperfect tenses, that end in** bi?

An. The Rule for the forming of the *Supine* from a preterperfect tense ending in *bi*, is this: *Bi sibi tum formabi; sic namque bibi bibitum fit.*

Bi sibi tum formabi.

Qu. **What is the meaning of that Rule?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That of a Preterperfect tense ending in *bi*, the Supine is formed by changing *bi* into *bitum*: as of *bibi* by such change is made *bibitum*.

¶ *Bi sibi tum formabi*] I should rather say by changing *i* into *itum* or *bi* into *bitum*, than by adding *tum* unto *bi*: because the *i* in *bi* in the preterperf. is long; but the *i* in *itum* or *bitum* in the Supine is short: and therefore there is more in the forming of this Supine, than a bare addition of *tum*, there is also a mutation of *i* long into *i* short.

Qu. **How is the word in this Rule declined?**

An. The word in this Rule are declined thus:

The declining of the word.

Bibo, bibis, bibi, bibere, bibitum.

Qu. **What is the Rule for the formation of the Supine from a preterperfect tense in** ci?

An. The Rule for the forming of the Supine from a preterperfect in *ci* is this ——— ;

Ci fit ctum.

Ci fit ctum, ut vici victum testatur, & ici
Dans ictum.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That of a preterperfect ending in *ci*, the Supine is formed by chang-

changing *ci* into *ctum*: as of *vici* by ſuch change is made *victum*; and of *ici ictum*.

Qu. **Is there any Exception from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule there is no exception: yet upon it we are to make this *obſervation*, That thoſe verbs appertaining to it, which did change *a* in their preſent tenſe into *e* in their preterperfect tenſe; do in their Supine change the *e* again into *a*: ſo as that of *feci* formed from *facio*, is not made *fectum* in the Supine, but *factum*: nor of *jeci* from *jacio*, *jectum*, but *jactum*; and ſo our Authour, *Feci factum*, *jeci quoque jactum*

¶ This obſervation is not peculiar to this Rule, but extends it ſelf further, even unto all thoſe verbs of what Rule ſoever, that have changed either *a*, or *æ* in their preſent tenſe into *e* or *i* in their preterperfect tenſe, which all in their Supine do reſume or take again their changed letter: as theſe which changed *a* into *e*; *pango pegi*, *frango fregi*, *ago egi*, *fallo fefelli*, *capio cepi*, *pario peperi*, *do das dedi*, *ſto ſtas ſteti* have *pactum*, *fractum*, *actum*, *falſum*, *captum*, *partum*, *datum*, *ſtatum*. So theſe which changed *a* or *æ* into *i*, *cado cecidi*, *cædo cecidi*, *pago pepigi*, *tango tetigi*, *cano cecini* have *caſum*, *cæſum*, *pactum*, *tactum*, & *cantum*.

Et ici dansictum] Of the preſent tenſe of this verb we have an example in *Plaut. Truc.* 2. 7. *Hoc vide, dentibus frendit, icit femur.* Of the preterperfect in his *Vidular. Ibi ut piſcabar, Fuſcinâ ici vidulum.*

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus: The declining of the words.

Vinco, vincis, vici, vincere, victum.
Ico, icis, ici, icere, ictum,
Facio, facis, feci, facere, factum,
Jacio, jacis, jeci, jacere, jactum.

Qu. **What is the Rule for the forming of Supines from preterperfect tenſes in di?**

An. The Rule for the forming of Supines from pre-

preterperfect tenses ending in *di*, is this:

Di fit sum. *Di fit sum, vidi visum.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That of a preterperfect ending in *di* the Supine is formed by changing *di* into *sum*, as of *vidi* by such change is made *visum*.

Qu. **Are there any words excepted from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule there are *excepted* four Supines, which end in *tum*, though formed from preterperfect tenses in *di*, viz. *tentum* from *tetendi*, *peditum* from *pepedi*; *datum* from *dedi*; and (which here is not named) *estum* from *edi*.

Qu. **What is the meaning of that first Note annexed to this Rule**, viz. —— *Quædam geminant si ut pandi passum, sedi sessum: adde scidi quod Dat scissum, atque fidi fissum, fodi quoque fossum.*

An. The meaning of that Note is this: That some Supines formed from preterperfect tenses in *di*, besides the change of *di* into *sum* in the end, do also assume or take in *s* before *sum* in the middle, as in *sedi sessum*, *scidi scissum*, *fidi fissum*, *fodi fossum*.

¶ *Geminant s*] This taking of letters into the middle, besides the change of the last syllable, is not peculiar to this Rule, but extends to verbs of other Rules also. Thus *missum* and *pastum* from *misi* and *pavi* take in *s*; *tunsum* and *punctum* from *tutudi* and *pupugi* take in *n*; *haustum* from *hausi* takes in *t*; *solutum* and *volutum* from *solvi* and *volvi* take in *u*.

ut pandi passum] This verb did anciently form a regular Supine *Pansum*, from the preterperfect tense *pandi*. And though *Alvarus* and *Despauterius*, *Ramus* and *Rhenius*, and diverse of our English Writers, as *Hayne*, *Shirley*, *Harris*, name no other Supine for this verb, but *passum*: Yet *Vossius* and *Farnaby*, *Burles* and *Jac. Berengi* do give it *pansum*, as well as *passum*. Thence *Prudent.* in *Cathemer. Hymn. ult.* *Pansis in al-*

tum

tum brachiis. & l. 1. *cont. Symmach. Vix panso poterat currere carbaso.* And thence saith *Voss. (Etymol. Lat.* p. 113. in *Pliny* is *expansa retia. Gell.* l. 15. c. 15. hath *capillo quoque mulier passo dicitur quasi porrecto & expanso,* even in that very place, where he denies the use of *pansum* and *expansum*: but whence can *expansus* come, but from *expansum*? and whence that, but from *pansum*? So *Lucret.* l. 1. *Deniq; fluctifrago suspensa in litore vestes ureſcunt, eædem dispansæ in sole sereſcunt.* So *Plantin* in his Edition plants it; and so *Vossius* saith the place was written in his own, and other Manuscripts. Whence *Danes.* gives *dispansum* for the Supine of *Dispandi,* which were anciently *dispendi dispessum,* as he saith, *Schol.* l. 2. c. 13. *Tertull. adv. Gent.* c. 48. *Dispositioni æternitatis aulæi vice oppansa est. Minut. Felix in Octavio. Signum planè naturaliter visimus in navi, cum velis tumentibus vehitur, cum expansis palmulis labitur.* But now it seems *Euphoniæ gratiâ* there is a change of the *n* into *s*, so that of *pansum* is made *passum* and *expassum.* Thence *Cic. passis velis pervehi.* And *Virg. Æn.* 1. *Ecce trahebatur passis Priameïa virgo Crinibus.* And *Tacit.* l. 21. *Expassæ repente delubri fores.* The users of *pansum* are noted by *Rhenius* to be *recentiores.* p. 190.

This changing of letters in the middle (that by the way upon this occasion we may speak of it) happens also in other verbs. Thus in *fressum* of *frendi n* is changed, as here into *s*; in *lotum* from *lavi a* is changed into *o*; in *lautum* from *lavi*, and *cautum* from *cavi a* is changed into *au*; in *satum* from *sevi e* is changed into *a*; in *vulsum* from *velli* (if *vulsum* must according to our *Authour* be formed from *velli*, and not rather from *vulsi*) and in *sepultum* from *sepelivi e* is changed into *u*; and in *cultum* from *colui o* is changed into *u*.

Adde scidi quod dat sciſſum] Of *scidi* saith *Vossius,* as the Supine (as I suppose that should be, which is misprinted *præteritum*) *sciſum,* for which they vulgarly use *sciſſum*: for which he supposes the reason to be, because

cause that in *scisum* the first vowel is long, whereas in *scidi* it is short. But from *scisum* he cites out of Livie l. 3. *Detruncata corpora brachiis abscisis.* and *Jastin.* l. 15. *Abscisis manibus.* But use hath prevailed to have it written with a double *ss*.

Qu. **What is the meaning of that second Note annexed to the Rule, touching the Supines of verbs, which double the first syllable of the present in the preterperfect tense,** viz.

Hic etiam advertas.

Hic etiam advertas, quod syllaba prima supinis
Quam vult præteritum geminari non geminatur:
Idque totondi dans tonsum docet, atque cecidi
Quod cæsum, & cecidi quod dat cæsum, atque tetendi
Quod tensum & tentum, tutudi tunsum, atque pepedi
Quod format peditum; adde dedi quod jure datum vult.

An. The meaning of this second Note is this: That such verbs as have a reduplication of their first syllable of the present tense in their preterperfect tense, have not that reduplication in their Supines. So that of *totondi* is made not, *totonsum*, but *tonsum*; of *cecidi*, not *cecæsum* but *cæsum*; of *tetendi* not *tetensum* or *tetentum* but *tensum & tentum*; of *tutudi* not *tutunsum* but *tunsum*; of *pepedi*, not *pepeditum*, but *peditum*.

¶ *Hic etiam advertas*] This note is not peculiar neither to the verbs in this Rule, but is extended unto other verbs also, : as namely unto *pepigi pactum*, *pupugi punctum*; *pepuli pulsum*; *ceculi* (if any such preterperfect tense may be allowed of) *culsum*; *fefelli fulsum*; and *cecini cantum*.

Atque tetendi quod tensum & tentum] From *tensum* comes *tensus* Stat. 9. *Theb. Poplite tenso saxa tenet. Lucan.* l. 1. *Et varias ignis tenso dedit aere formas. Id.* l. 4. *Tensisque rudentibus actæ.* From *tentum* comes *tentus* Hor. 2. *Serm. Seu pingui tentus omaso Furius. Id. Epod.* 16 *Refertque tenta Grex amicus ubera. Id. Ep.* 17. *Nec quæ est levare tanta spiritu præcordia.* Ib. *Od.* 12. *Tenta cubilia tectaque rumpit.*

Tutudi tunsum] Thence *Virgil. Georg.* 3. *Tunsa gallo*

galla admiſcere ſaporem. Id. Georg. 4. Tunſis gemet area frugibus. Æn. 1. Tunſæ pectora palmis. This verb hath another Supine, namely *tuſum.* Thence *tuſus. Plin.* l. 22. c. 13. *Radix tuſa cum aceto non minus utilis. Ib.* c. 21. *Folia tuſa in paſtillo digerunt. Ib.* c. 25. *Panis tuſus atque iterum coctus. Daneſ. Voſſius Farnaby.*

Atque pepedi quod format peditum] *Deſpauterius, Voſſius, Farnaby* and *Burles, Ramus* and *Rhenius,* &c. give this verb a Supine: Other Grammarians think otherwiſe. Mr. *Harris* gives it none. *Richerius* denies it hath any. *Alvarus* and *Duisburgenſis* ſpeak warily of it. This laſt ſaith, *Supinum eſt peditum, licet non ſit multum frequens.* The former, *Hujus verbi ſupinum non facilè invenies: qui putant habere peditum, non ſatis probant.* Whereupon ſome are ſo wiſe as to ſay nothing of it, as *Hayne* and *Bird.* That *Voſſius* allows of it, he gives you his ground, which is his reading the verbal *peditus* or *peditum* in *Catull. Carm.* 5. 5. *Subtile & leve peditum Libonis*; and his finding it in *Charisius* l. 2. If you like not his reaſon, which is the beſt, and all I ſee given, you may put it out, as ſome do, and in the ſtead of it write, —*atque pependi Quod format penſum.* Which Supine is generally allowed of, as from *pendo,* though not as from *pendeo,* which *Voſſius* and *Farnaby* deprive of Supine, though *Harris* and *Richerius* are pleaſed to give it one, with whom do ſide not *Ramus* only, but *Rhenius,* who ſaith, thence is formed *penſilis,* uſed by *Plaut.* in *Pſeud.* 1. 1. *Reſtim volo mihi emere, qui me faciam penſilem.*

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule and its Notes declined?**

An. The words in this Rule and Notes are declined thus:

The Declining of the words.

Video, vides, vidi, videre, viſum.
Pando, pandis, pandi, pandere, paſſum [*& panſum.*]
Sedeo, ſedes, ſedi, ſedere, ſeſſum.
Scindo, ſcindis, ſcidi, ſcindere, ſciſſum.
Findo, findis, fidi, findere, fiſſum.

Fodio, fodis, fodi, fodere, foſſum.
Tondeo, tondes, totondi, tondere, tonſum.
Cædo, cædis, cæcidi, cædere, cæſum.
Cado, cadis, cecidi, cadere, caſum.
Tendo, tendis, tetendi, tendere, tenſum [*& tentum.*]
Tundo, tundis, tutudi, tundere, tunſum [*& tuſum.*]
Pedo, pedis, pepedi, pedere, peditum.
Do, das, dedi, dare, datum.

Qu. **What is the Rule for the Supines of preterperfect tenſes ending in** Gi?

Gi fit ctum.

An. The Rule for the forming of Supines from preterperfect tenſes ending in *gi*, is this: *Gi fit ctum*, as *legi lectum.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of that Rule?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That of a preterperfect tenſe ending in *gi*, the Supine is formed by changing *gi* into *ctum*: as of *legi* by ſuch change is made *lectum.*

Qu. **What Exceptions are there from this Rule?**

An. There is but one word properly excepted from it, which is *fugi*, from which the Supine is formed, not by changing *gi* into *ctum*, but into *gitum.*

In all the other words *gi* is changed into *ctum*: only there is in them ſome further alteration in their former and middle ſyllables; the reduplications omitted, as in *pepigi, tetigi*, and *pupugi*; and the firſt vowel of the preſent retained, as in *pegi* of *pango*, *pepigi* of *pago*, *fregi* of *frango*, *tetigi* of *tango*, and *egi* of *ago*; and the *n* in the preſent tenſe of *pungo*, that was left out in *pupugi* the preterperfect tenſe, reaſſumed into the Supine *punctum* (if it muſt be ſaid to be formed of *pupugi*, and not rather of *punxi*, which though hardly found alone, yet is the common preterperfect tenſe to the compounds of *pungo.*) So our Authour goes on——

——*tegi pepigique*
Dat pactum, fregi fractum, tetigi quoque tactum,
Egi actum, pupugi punctum; fugi fugitum dat.

Qu.

Qu. How are the words of this Rule declined?

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus: The declining of the words.

Lego, legis, legi, legere, lectum.
Pango, pangis, pegi, & panxi, pangere, pactum.
[Pago, pagis,] pepigi, [pagere,] pactum.
Frango, frangis, fregi, frangere, fractum.
Tango, tangis, tetegi, tangere, tactum.
Ago, agis, egi, agere, actum.
Pungo, pungis, pupugi, pungere, punctum.
Fugio, fugis, fugi, fugere, fugitum.

Qu. What is the Rule for the forming of Supines from Preterperfect tenses in li?

An. The Rule for the forming of Supines from preterperfect tenses ending in *li* is this ——— *Li fit sum.*

Li fit sum; ut falli ſtans pro ſale condio ſalſum.

Qu. What is the meaning of this Rule?

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That of a preterperfect tense ending in *li*, the Supine is formed by changing *li* into *ſum*: as of *falli* by such change is made *ſalſum*.

Qu. Is there any Exception from this Rule?

An. From this Rule there are properly but three words excepted. The first is *tuli*, whose Supine *latum* is either a word borrowed from elsewhere to supply the place of a Supine to it, or else formed of it, by changing *li* into *latum*, and casting away the first syllable *tu*. The second is *pepuli*; and the third *cecidi*, which form not *li* but *i* into *ſum*, and do moreover cast away the initial reduplicated syllables *pe* and *ce*, so making *pulſum* and *cuſum*.

Qu. But are the other two words in the Rule regularly formed?

An. The other two words in the Rule are regularly formed as touching the last syllable: for they both change *li* into *ſum*, according to the Rule. But the first, namely *falſum*, resumes the first vowel of its present tense, and rejects the reduplication in the preterperfect

tense: So of *fefelli* making *falsum*. And the second namely *vulsum* (if *vulsum* must be formed of *velli*, and not of *vulsi*) besides the change of *li* into *sum* in the end changes also e into *u* in the beginning, So of *velli* making *vulsum*. So our Author, *Dat pepuli pulsum, seculi culsum, atque fefelli Falsum; dat velli vulsum; tuli habet quoque latum.*

¶ *Salli stans pro sale condio*] This Note *stans pro sale condio* is put here to distinguish *salli* of *sallo* from *salli* of *psallo* (as some write it, though the right writing be *Psalli*) the former hath *salsum* for his Supine, the latter hath no Supine. Anciently there hath been *salitum* or *sallitum*; whence *salitus* or *sallitus*. *Corn. Sever. Ad quem salliti pomiliones adferebantur.* But that was of *salivi* of the fourth conjugation, in all likelihood.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus:

The declining of the words.

Sallo, sallis, salli, sallere, salsum,
Pello, pellis, pepuli, pellere, pulsum.
Cello, cellis, cecuti, cellere, culsum.
Percello, percellis, perculi, percellere, perculsum.
Fallo, fallis, fefelli, fallere, falsum.
Vello, vellis, velli [& vulsi,] vellere, vulsum.
Fero, fers, tuli, ferre, latum.

Qu. **What Rule is there for the forming of Supines from preterperfect tenses in** mi, ni, pi, and qui?

An. For the forming of Supines from preterperfect tenses ending in *mi, ni, pi,* and *qui,* there is this Rule.

Mi, ni, pi, qui tum fiunt.

Mi, ni, pi, qui tum fiunt, velut hic manifestum.
Emi emtum, veni ventum, cecini a cano cantum,
A capio cepi dans captum, a cœpio cœptum;
A rumpo rupi ruptum, liqui quoque lictum.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That of a preterperfect tense ending in *mi, ni,* or *pi*, a Supine is formed by changing *i* into *tum*; and of a preterperfect ending

ending in *qui* a Supine is formed by changing *qui* into *ctum*.

As of *emi* by such change is made *emtum*; of *veni ventum*; of *ceeini* (*a* of the present tense being withal resumed, and *ce* the reduplication in the preterperfect tense being rejected) is made *cantum*; of *cepi* from *capio* (the first vowel of the present tense being resumed) is made *captum*; of *cœpi* from *cœpio* is made *cœptum*; of *rupi ruptum*; and of *liqui lictum*.

¶ *Emi emptum*] So it is written ordinarily; but the right writing is *emtum*, and most agreeing with this Rule, which saith *mi tum fit*, not *mi ptum*. Though it rather methinks should have been, *Mi, ni, pi faciunt tum, qui ctum hic ut manifestum*; or in some such way. For strictly, if *mi*, &c. be made *tum*, then *emi* will neither be *emtum*, nor *emptum*, but *etum*, so *veni*, not *ventum*, but *vetum*, &c.

A cœpio cœptum] This verb is looked upon as a Defective: (and so delivered to be afterward in our Grammar, like *odi* and *memini*) in the present tense, at least *magnâ ex parte*. And I suppose that, and the tenses coming of it, are not very vulgarly read. Yet read they are, some of them at least, both in *Plaut.* and *Ter.* and *Cato*. From this last *Vossius* quotes, *Cœpiam seditiosa verba loqui*. And so from *Cæcilius in Peribœa*. *Aere obscuro hercle desinam, Mane cœpiam. Plaut. Truc.* 2. 1. *ubi nihil habeat alium quæstum cœpiat. Id. Manech.* 5. 5. *Neque ego insanio, neque ego pugnas, neque lites cœpio. Id. Persa.* 1. 3. *Lubido extemplo cœpere est convivium. Ter. Ad.* 3. 3 (or as some read 4.) *Annon sex totis mensibus Prius olfeci ssim, quàm ille quidquam cœperet*. So *Vossius* reads it, though others *cœperit*; and so *Turnebus*, adding, *omnino legendum est cœperet, ab antiquo verbo cœpio; nam temporum ratio illud cœperit refutat, & aspernatur; cœperet autem flagitat & poscit*. And so *Donatus*. But whether all this will serve either to render this verb no defective, or to bring it back again into use I know not. See *Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 39. *Alvar.* p. 243.

Liqui quoque lictum] The ſimple Supine *lictum*, or any thing of it, is hardly read but in *Priſcian*, and from him in *Stephanus*, but without any example of it, or derivative participle, or verbal from it. Thence our *Authour* afterwards reckons it among them that want Supines. *Reſpuo, linquo, luo, &c.* And ſo both Mr. *Harris* leaves it without Supine; and *Richerius*; declining it *linquo liqui, rejecto ſupino.* Yet in the compounds of it, *delinquo* and *relinquo lictum* is read. And ſo *Alvarus* ſaith, *Linquo caret ſupino, compoſita habent; ut relictum, delictum*; and ſo *Richerius, compoſita lictum fabricant in ſupino, ut delinquo deliqui, delictum, &c.* And thence it is that that thoſe, give this word a Supine, as our *Authour* here, *Deſpauterius, Ramus, Rhenius, Voſſius, Shirley* and *Bird*, are to be underſtood (as I conceive) as meaning only, that it hath a Supine when it is compounded. And accordingly *Alvarus* gives the Rule for this verb thus: *Linquo ſibi liqui, cupiunt ſibi pignora lictum.* And ſo *Hayne, a liqui formato relictum*; adding in his Margine this Note, with a reference to the Supine *relictum. In compoſito relinquo: Supina verbi ſimplicia non leguntur.* And Mr. *Farnaby* and *Burles* to ſhew the ſame have only the compound *relinquo, reliqui, relictum*, and not the ſimple *linquo, liqui lictum.* And with this diſtinction of having a Supine, when it is compounded, and of having no Supine, when it is not compounded, is that contradiction of himſelf wherewith our Authour by ſome is charged, eaſily ſalved and cleared.

Qu. **How are the words of this rule declined?**

The declining of the words.

An. The words of this rule are declined thus:

Emo, emis, emi, emere, emtum.
Venio, venis, veni, venire, ventum.
Cano, canis, cecini, canere, cantum.
Capio, capis, cepi, capere, captum.
[*Cæpio, cæpis*] *cæpi*, [*cæpere*] *cæptum.*
Rumpo, rumpis, rupi, rumpere, ruptum.
Linquo, linquis, liqui, linquere, lictum.

Qu.

Qu. **What is the Rule for the Supine of a Preterperfect tense ending in** Ri?

An. The Rule for the forming of a Supine from a preterperfect tense in *Ri* is this—— *Ri fit sum.*

Ri fit sum, ut verri versum.

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That of a Preterperfect tense ending in *ri*, a Supine is formed by changing *ri* into *sum*; as of *verri* by such change is made *versum.*

Qu. **Is there any exception from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule *partum* is excepted, which besides that it casts away the reduplication of the preterperfect tense, and resumes the first vowel of the present tense, changes also *ri* into *tum*, so that from *peperi* of *pario* is formed *partum.*

¶ *Verri versum*] It may be supposed that antiently it hath formed *verritum*: because thence formed may be read *converritor.* Whence *Appul.* in *Apologia*, hath *converritorem pridianæ reliquiæ*: but all too old to be brought back into use.

Partum] I conceive *partum* may be said to be made by a *Syncope* from *paritum*, and that formed from *parui*: both because some of the compounds of *pario* have *perui* in the preterperfect tense, as *operio* and *aperio*; and because the participle in *rus*, formed from this verb is *pariturus.* See before, *fit rio ri*: and *Cujus nata peri.* But But I will not contend with any about it. Only I shall tell him that *Despauterius* from *peperi* of *pario* forms both *partum* and *paritum*: *Dat pario peperi partum paritum.* So he whom *Daisburgensis* follows therein saying, *Dat peperi partum vel paritum; hinc pariturus, illinc partus.*

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?** The declining of the words.

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus:

Verro, verris, verri, verrere, versum.
Pario, paris, peperi, parere, partum.

Qu. **What is the Rule for the Supine of Preterperfect tenses ending in ſi?**

An. The Rule for forming a Supine from a preter-perfect tenſe ending in *ſi* is this: *Si fit ſum ut vidi viſum.* *Si fit ſum.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this, That of a preterperfect ending in *ſi* a Supine is formed by changing *ſi* into *ſum*: as of *viſi* by ſuch change is made *viſum*.

Qu. **Are there any Exceptions from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule only theſe eight Supines are properly excepted, which end in *tum*, though formed from preterperfect tenſes in *ſi*, namely *fultum*, *hauſtum*, *ſartum*, *fartum*, *uſtum*, *geſtum*, *tortum* and *indultum*: for as for *miſſum*, that doth agree with the Rule, only (as hath before been obſerved of others) it takes in *s* into the middle of it, or doubles the *s* in it; So our Authour ——

——— *Tamen s geminato*
Miſi formabit miſſum: ſulſi excipe fultum
Hauſi hauſtum, ſarſi ſartum, farſi quoque fartum,
uſſi uſtum, geſſi geſtum: torſi duo tortum
Et torſum, indulſi indultum indulſumq́, requirit.

¶ *Viſi viſum*] Unleſs we like rather to form *viſum* alwaies from *vidi*, this may go for *Voſſius*, or any elſe.

Fulſi excipe fultum] This *fulſi* is not of *fulgeo* of the ſecond conjugation, which perhaps borrows a preterperfect tenſe from *fulgo* of the third (read in *Lucret.* l. 5. *Fulgĕre cum cœli donavit plaga vapores.* And ib. l. 6. *Fulgit item cum rarefcunt quoque nubila cœli*) for that verb hath no Supines: but from *fulcio* of the fourth.

Hauſi hauſtum] *Hauſtum* is made of *hauſum* by putting in *t* after the *s*. Thence *hauſurus* in *Virg. Æn.* 4. *Supplicia hauſurum ſcopulis.* In *Appul.* there is found *hauri-*

hauritum: but that is formed from *haurivi*, as much also out of use, as *hauritum* is. *Vossius, Farnaby, Danesius.*

Farsi fartum] *Fartum* is by a *Syncope* put for *farctum*, as that by a *Syncope* is put for *farcitum*, whence *farcimen* and *farcitus*; which *Cic. in Verr.* hath, *Pulvinus perlucidus Melitensi rosâ farcitus.* but is now hardly used.

Torsi duo tortum & torsum] With our *Authour* herein agrees the *Gryphisw. Gram.* and *Rhenius* who from *torsi* saith *torsio* is formed, which Substantive is read in *Plin.* l. 20. c. 17. *Ejus usus contra torsiones stomachi.* But in none else can I find *torsum*, unless with a note intimating its antiquation: *Vossius* having mentioned *tortum* adds: *Veteres tamen & torsum dixere, unde Cato* 2. *Orig. Marsus hostem occidit prius, quàm Pelignus: Propterea Marucini vocantur de marso detortum nomen.* So *Alvarus, Torsum a torqueo apud vetissimos reperitur, sed jam exolevit. Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 24. *Alvar.* p. 240.

¶ *Indulsi indultum indulsumque*–] *Indultum* is by all allowed of; *indulsum* by none beside our *Authour* that I meet with except *Sebastian Duisburgensis*, who saith of *indulgeo*, that it sometime hath *indulsum*. It might have been wished he had named some *Authority* for it. But that is no easie matter to do, at least in the opinion of *Alvarus*, who saith, *Indulsum nonfacile invenies, neq; Grammatici ullum testem citant.* p. 240. And till we have authority for the use of it, we may do well to let the using of it alone.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?** The declining of the words.

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus:

Viso, visis, visi, visere, visum.
Mitto, mittis, misi, mittere, missum.
Fulcio, fulcis fulsi, fulcire, fultum.
Haurio, hauris, hausi, haurire, haustum,
Sarcio, sarcis, sarsi, sarcire, sartum.
Uro, uris, ussi, urere, ustum.

Gero,

Gero, geris, gessi, gerere gestum.
Torqueo, torques, torsi, torquere, tortum.
Indulgeo, indulges, indulsi, indulgere, indultum.

Qu. What is the Rule for the forming of a Supine from a preterperfect ending in psi ?

An. The Rule for the forming of a Supine from a preterperfect ending in *psi* is this: *Psi fit ptum, scripsi scriptum.*

Psi fit ptum.

Qu. What is the meaning of this Rule ?

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That of a preterperfect ending in *psi* the Supine is formed by changing *psi* into *ptum*; as of *Scripsi* by such change is made *scriptum.*

Qu. Are there any Exceptions from this Rule ?

An. From this Rule *campsum* is excepted, which forms *psi* into *psum*, if any such word be read, and may be admitted as *cambio.*

¶ *Psi fit ptum*] So of *sorpsi* is made *sorptum*: and also for *sorbitum*, which seems to have been in use, because thence is formed *sorbitio* used in *Plaut. Pseud.* 3. *Quia sorbitione faciam ego te hodie mea*—that is formed from *sorbitum* of *sorbui.*

Campsi excipe campsum] See *Quarta dat is ivi*, before.

Qu. How are the words of this Rule declined ?

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus:

The declining of the words.

Scribo, scribis, scripsi, scribere, scriptum.
Cambio, cambis, campsi, cambire, campsum.

Qu. What is the Rule for the forming of a Supine from a preterperfect ending in ti ?

An. The Rule for the forming of a Supine from a preterperfect ending in *ti* is this ——

Ti fit tum;

Ti fit tum; a flo namque steti, a fistoque stiti fit
Præterito commune statum.

Qu. What is the meaning of this Rule ?

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That of

reterperfect ending in *ti*, a Supine is formed by changing *ti* into *tum*: as of *ſteti* by ſuch change (and the remotion of *e*) is made *ſtatum*.

Qu. **Is there any exception from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule is excepted *verſum* which is formed of *verti*, by changing *ti* into *ſum*; ſo ſaith our Authour

——*Verti excipe verſum.*

¶ *A ſto namque ſteti, a ſiſtoque ſtiti fit Præterito commune ſtatum*] That is from *ſteti* the preterperfect of *ſto*, and from *ſtiti* the preterperfect of *ſiſto* (actively ſignifying to *make to ſtand*) is formed one Supine *ſtatum*, hence comes *ſtatus* ſignifying as much as τεταγμένος, as in *ſtati dies*, and *ſtata ſacrificia* as *Voſſius* ſaith, *Etymolog.* p. 122.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus: The declining of the words.

ſto, ſtas, ſteti, ſtare, ſtatum.
ſiſto, ſiſtis, ſtiti, ſiſtere, ſtatum.
vento, vertis, verti, vertere, verſum.

Qu. **What is the Rule for the forming of a Supine from a preterperfect tenſe in** Vi?

An. The Rule for the forming of a Supine from a preterperfect in *vi* is this: *Vi fit tum, ut flavi flatum.* *Vi fit tum.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That of a preterperfect ending in *vi* the Supine is formed by changing *vi* into *tum*; as of *flavi* by ſuch change is made *flatum*.

Qu. **Are there any Exceptions from this Rule?**

An. From this Rule there are eleven verbs, which have ſupines ſomewhat differing; not in reſpect of their laſt ſyllable, for they all change *vi* into *tum*, and ſo far agree with the Rule, but in reſpect of ſome other letter, or ſyllable, which is added to, taken from, or altered in them.

The

The first is *pavi*, which in the ſupine takes in *s* befo *tum*; ſo of *pavi* making *paſtum*.

The ſecond is *lavi*, which unto *a* takes in *u* befo *tum*, and ſo of *lavi* makes *lautum*, for which they antien ly (changing the *a*, or *au* into *o*) ſaid *lotum* (for as *lavatum* that is regularly formed of *lavavi* now out uſe.

The third is *potavi*, which by the taking out of from *potatum* regularly formed makes *potum*.

The fourth is *favi*, of which, by the change of *a* in *au*, is made *fautum*.

The fifth is *Cavi*, of which, by the like change of into *au*, is made *cautum*.

The ſixth is *ſævi*, of which with the change of *e* in *a* is made *ſatum*.

The ſeventh is *levi*, which with the change of *e* in *i* is made *litum* (for as for *livi* antiently uſed *litum* regular, as formed of that; and ſo of *lini*, not by th but a former Rule, *Mi, ni, pi- tum fiunt.*)

The eight is *ſolvi*, of which by the taking in of *u* b fore *tum*, is made *ſolutum*.

The ninth is *volvi*, of which by the like taking in of before *tum* is made *volutum*.

The tenth is *ſingultivi*, of which by the loſs of *ti* b fore *tum* is made *ſingultum*.

The eleventh is *ſepelivi*, of which by the loſs of *i* b fore *tum*, and the change of *e* before *l* into *u* is made *ſe pultum*.

Qu. **Why do you not except venum, which di fers more from the Rule than any of them?**

An. I do not except *venum*, becauſe *venum* is Supine of *veneo*, but a part of its compoſition, wh is made up of *venum* and *eo*; ſo that *veneo* hath no S pine.

¶ *Flavi flatum*] *Flavi* here is of *flo flas*: not *flaveo flaves*, for that hath no Supines.

Pavi excipe paſtum] *Pavi* here is of *paſco*, not of *veo*, for that hath no Supines.

Dat lavi lotum interdum lautum atque lavatum] Of *lavo lavas* comes *lavatum*: but of *lavo lavis* in all likelihood comes *lautum* and *lotum*. Some would have *lautum* made of *lavitum* by a *Syncope*: but if *i* be taken out, there muſt ſtill be a change of the *v* conſonant into *u* vowel, and a coalition of thoſe two into one Diphthong *au* to the making of *lautum*. Neither will it ſo agree with our Rule, for when *vi* is taken away from *lavi* to be changed into *tum*, there will remain nothing but *a*: the eaſier way therefore it appears to me, to change *a* into *au*, and then for the reſt all is according to the Rule; and the ſame may be ſaid of *favi* and *cavi*. But ſtill if any think it better to form them of *lavitum*, *favitum*, *cavitum*, I ſhall not gain-ſay.

Potavi potum interdum facit & potatum] *Potatum* uſed in *Plaut. Pſeud.* 5. 2. *I ſimul mecum potatum*. Hence by a *Syncope* is made *potum*. Which is uſed by *Virgil. Eclog.* 9. *Et potum paſtas age Tityre*. From *potaturus* comes *potaturus*, uſed by *Ter. Phorm.* 5. 5. *Nam potaturus apud me eſt*. From *potum* comes *potus* ordinarily read. *Virg. Georg.* 4. *Quoque modo potis gaudent intyba fibris*: and *poturus*, *Lucan.* l. 5. *Strymona & gelidum bruma pellente relinquunt Poturæ te Nile ſues*.

Cavi cautum] This Supine *Voſſius* forms of *cavitum* by a *Syncope* of *i*, but he muſt alſo change *av* into *au*, elſe it will not do. Hence comes *cavitio* as *Feſtus* ſaith, for that which now we ſay *cautio*. And (as *Scaliger* reads that in *Plaut. Pſeud.* 2.3. which ordinarily is read *cavata*) *cavita eſt*. *Nam ipſa mihi opportunitas non poſſit opportunius Advenire, quam hæc cavita eſt mihi opportune epiſtola*. *Friſchlin* would have it formed of *catum*, and becauſe *catus* ſignifying *adviſed*, wary, *prudent*, ſeems derived from thence. *Plaut. Epid.* 2. 2. hath *cautium catum*: and both *Plaut. Pſeud.* 2. 3. & *Cic.* 1 *Offic. homo catus*. And *Plaut. Trin.* 3. 2. *Proinde ut cor-des amantes ſunt cati*. *Voſſius* rejects this, becauſe *catus*, as he ſaith, never is a Participle. I will not be Umpire

pire betwixt them: Either way from *catum* or *cavitum* by Addition, or Subtraction, and due alteration, we may form *cautum*: and that's all I care for at present.

Litum] Hence comes *litus* used both in the simple and compound way. In the *simple*. *Virg.* 4. *Georg.* *paribus lita corpora guttis*. *Martial.* l. 10. Ep. 68. *Dequæ coloratis nunquam lita mater Etruscis*. In the *compound*. *Cic.* 1. *Ep. ad Calv. apud Priscian. Tuli molestè, quod literæ delitæ sunt a te redditæ. Tabulæ se interlitæ esse clamant.*

Vult singultivi singultum] Whether *singultum* or *singultitum* be the Supine of this verb, *Vossius* saith, *non satis convenit*. Yet he set down the former (and so do all I meet withal) for the Supine of it; moved thereto by the consideration of *singultus* the verbal. *Rhenius* considering that, and *singulto* also, set it down so too. *Duisburgensis*, when he so set it down, besides his Author *Despauterius*, who delivers that for the Supine of it, had an eye to the Adverb *singultim* used by *Horace*, as he cites him, *ut veni coram singultim multa loquutus*. Yet *Vossius* considering also that *singultus* may perhaps better come from *singultio*, resolved into this opinion, *ut omnino satius sit Supino abstinere*. *De Etymolog. Lat.* p. 125.

Veneo, venis, venivi, venum] *Veneo* is compounded of *venum* and *eo*, as *venundo* or *Venum* and *do*, and *pessundo* of *pessum* and *do*, and *satisdo* of *satis* and *do*. But verbs are not compounded of, nor formed from their Supines, but Supines formed from their verbs. Therefore being part of the composition of *veneo*, it can be no Supine of it; no more than *pessum* or *satis* can be the Supine of *pessundo* or *satisdo*. And indeed *venum* is a Noun. Hence *Tacit.* 13. *Annal. Militibus immunitas servaretur, nisi in iis quæ veno exercerent.* Ib. l. 14. *Posita veno irritamenta luxus.* So that *venire* is in our word *ad venum ire*, or *venum ire*, without, but understanding *ad*, as *Plaut. Mercat. Prolog.* said, *mercatum*

re, for *ad mercatum ire*. See *Farnab.* p. 42. *Voſſ. Etymolog.* Lat. p. 130. and *Analog.* l. 3. c. 33. and the *Addenda* to that Book. p. 118. And if the authority and reaſon of theſe two great Grammarians muſt ſtand good, then in a miſtake will be not our Authour alone, but many more, as *Deſpauterius*, *Alvarus*, *Ramus*, *Richeſius*, *Gram. Gryphiſw. Hayne*, *Harris*, *Bird*, *Faſc-Bengi.* To ſupply the place of a Supine to this verb, which *Rhenius* ſaw had none of its own, he ſaith, *Supini eo uſurpatur adverbium venum.* p. 222. And Mr. *Shirn* compounds *veneo ex adverbio venum & eo*, *ſicut ex eſſum fit peſſundo.* That *peſſum* properly ſignifieth *deorſum*, *Pareus* ſaith in his *Lexicon Plaut.* and ſo it is an adverb, and ſo he ſaith it is, *valens in imum locum, & quaſi ſub pedes.* But that *venum* is an Adverb is not to be ſo likely, as that it is a noun becauſe of the variations of caſe, which I find of that word, which agree not to an adverb. Yet I will not ſtubbornly contend with any about it: but having reported the opinions of Grammarians in this matter, leave the Reader to chuſe what he is beſt pleaſed withal.

Sepelivi vite ſepultum] *Cato in Thermis* cited by *Priſcian* l. 9. hath, *Mortuus eſt ſepelitus eſt.* Thence it is probable, that *ſepultum* was made by a *Syncope*, of *ſepelitum*, with the change of *e* into *u*. And ſo *Daneſius*, and *Voſſius* affirm. *Voſſ. Analog.* l. 3. c. 33. *Daneſ. Schol.* l. 2. c. 17.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus: The declining of the words.

flo, flas, flavi, flare, flatum.
paſco, paſcis, pavi, paſcere, paſtum.
lavo, lavis, lavi, lavere, lautum, & lotum.
luo, luas, lavi, lavare, lavatum.
poto, potas, potavi, potare, potatum, & potum.
faveo, faves, favi, favere, fautum.
caveo, caves, cavi, cavere, cautum.
ſero, ſeris, ſevi, ſerere, ſatum.
lino, linis, levi, [livi, lini] linere, litum.

Salvo

Solvo, solvis, solvi, solvere, solutum.
Volvo, volvis, volvi, volvere, volutum.
Singultio, singultis, singultivi, singultire, [singultum.]
Veneo, venis. [venivi] venii, venire.
Sepelio, sepelis, sepelivi, sepelire, sepultum.

Qu. **What Rule is there for the forming of a Supine from a preterperfect in** ui ?

Quod dat ui dat itum.

An. For the forming of a Supine from a preterperfect in *ui*, there is this Rule: *Quod dat ui, dat itum, ut domui domitum.*

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule ?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That of a Preterperfect ending in *ui* a Supine is formed by changing *ui* into *itum*: as of *domui* by such change is made *domitum*.

Qu. **Are there any Exceptions from the Rule ?**

An. From this Rule there are three Exceptions:

Qu. **What is the first Exception of ?**

An. The first Exception is of verbs in *uo*, which have *ui* in their preterperfect tense: for in them generally the Supine is formed of the preterperfect tense by changing *ui* into *utum*: as of *exuo exui* is made *exutum*: So our *Authour* ——*Excipe quodvis.*

Excipe quodvis verbum in uo.

Verbum in uo, quia semper ui formabit in utum, Exui ut exutum:

Qu. **But do not all verbs forming** uo **into** ui **the preterperfect tense, make** utum **in their Supine ?**

An. Not all verbs in *uo ui* have *utum*, but some *itum*, changing *i* into *itum*, or *ui* into *uitum*: as of *ruo rui* is formed *ruitum*. So our Authour——

A ruo deme rui ruitum dans.

——— *A ruo deme rui ruitum dans.*

¶ *Rui ruitum*] With our Authour herein, agree *Despauterius, Duisburgensis, Harris, Shirley, Rhenius, Richerius, Hayne, Alvarus, Burles.* But *Vossius* in his *Analog.* l. 3. c. 32. plainly saith, *A ruo est rui, ruitum.* And that such a Supine hath been in use, is evident

by *ruta cæſa* met withal, not only amongſt the latter Civilians, but in *Varro* de L. L. l. 8. *Ideoque in venditionis lege fundi ruta cæſa ita dicimus ut u producamus.* And again by the compounds of this verb, which have *rutum* in their Supines, acknowledged by thoſe, that allow the ſimple verb to have but *ruitum*; as *diruitum*, *eruitum*, whence the Participles *dirutus* and *erutus*. Yet withal that *ruitum* hath been uſed, appears by *ruiturus* derived from it, and uſed by *Lucan.* l. 2. v. 499. *Ite ſimul pedites, ruiturum aſcendite pontem.* So by *Ovid. Met.* l. 4. f. 13. *Aut petit, aut urges ruiturum Siſyphe ſaxum.* And by *diruitus* in an ancient *Inſcription* in *Rome*, wherein is *ædiculam diruitam*, as *Voſſius* cites it from *Gruter.* And by *eruiturus* in uſe, though from *erutum*, as *Voſſius* ſaith. Hence both *Voſſius* himſelf in his *Etymolog. Latin* p. 124 and *Ramus* and *Farnaby* and the *Gram.* of *Gryphiſw.* give unto this verb *ruitum* and *rutum*. And for ought I know, one may as well be uſed as the other. Hither may be referred *luo lui*, which (though it be hardly now to be found ῥητῶς expreſſed, and therefore is afterward ranked by our Authour amongſt thoſe, that *raro aut nunquam* have any Supines, yet) hath, or anciently hath had *luitum* for its Supine. Hence *luiturus* in *Claudian. Paneg. 6. Conſul. Honor ii.* --*Puppis Vaſtato tandem pœnas luitura profundo.* And hence *luitio* in *Ulpian* cited by *Stephanus.* Whereupon though *Deſputerius* and *Alvarus*, *Riverius*, *Hayne* and *Bird*, do deprive this verb of Supine, yet *Voſſius* and *Farnaby*, *Ramus* and *Burles*, *Rhenius* and the *Gryphiſwald Grammar*, *Shirley* and *Faſc. Berengi* do allow this verb *luitum* for its Supine. Which if it may be allowed, will be another exception to our Authours Exception from *ui* into *utum*, or rather the only Exception that ſo forms *ui*; becauſe *ruo* forms *ui* into *utum*, as well as into *uitum*, if not only *utum*; *uitum* being made of *utum* by the *Epentheſis*, or putting in of *i*. But thus much for the firſt Exception.

Q. What is the ſecond Exception of?

An. The ſecond Exception is of ſome particular words, which form their Supine by changing *ui* into *tum*: which as our Authour ſets them down are theſe:

Vult ſecui ſectum, necui nectum fricuiq́
Vult ſecui ſectum. *Frictum, miſcui item miſtum, ac amicui dat amictum.*
Torrui habet toſtum, docui doctum, tenuique
Tentum, conſului conſultum, alui altum alitumq́
Sic ſalui ſaltum, colui occulti quoq́ cultum.
Pinſui habet piſtum, rapui raptum, ſeruique
A ſero vult ſertum, ſic texui habet quoque textum.

Of which theſe thirteen, *ſecui*, *necui*, *fricui*, *amicui*, *docui*, *tenui*, *conſului*, *alui*, *ſalui*, *occulti*, *rapui*, *ſerui*, and *texui*, form a Supine in *tum*, by the juſt change of *ui* into *tum*, as *ſecui ſectum*, &c. but theſe four *miſcui*, *torui*, *colui* and *pinſui*, have ſome further alteration in them, by loſs, or change: *miſcui* loſeth *c*, and *pinſui* *n*: *colui* changes *o* into *u*, and *torrui* for two *r r*, takes in one *s*.

¶ *Vult ſecui ſectum*] *Sectum* is formed of *ſecui*, as things now ſtand, by changing *ui* into *tum*: but indeed originally it ſeems to be made by a Syncope of *ſecatum*, whence *ſecaturus in Colum.* l. 5. c. 9. mentioned before.

Necui nectum] *Nectum* is likewiſe by a *Syncope* formed from *necatum*: not that *nectum* the ſimple ſupine is any where read, but that *enecto* the compound of *necto*, is ſuppoſed to have *enectum*, becauſe thence is formed the participle *enectus* frequently read in *Cicero*. as 1 *Tuſc. Mento ſummo aquam attingens ſiti enectus Tantalus*. *Voſſius* alſo cites *Cic. Philip.* 14. for *internectus*: and though he mention not the words, yet *Stephanus*, from whom I ſuppoſe he took them upon truſt, doth *Internecti nota credo teſtamenta ſubjiciunt*. Though after all this, in that Oration I find no ſuch words. Perhaps they be in ſome other. He cites alſo *Plaut. Amphit.* for the ſame, but without any particular reference,

ference, which he uſeth to be very punctual in. But *Stephanus* again, from whom I ſuppoſe he took it, cites 4. 35. that is act. 1. ſc. 1. v. 35. *Duello extincto maximo, atque internecti is hoſtibus.* But there again, in one Edition it is *internecatis*; in another it is *internectis*, yet with *internecatis* in the Margine. And yet *enecatus* is alſo read of *eneco*, as was noted before from *Plin.* l. 18. c. 13. *Flaccidorum quoque & in horreis enecatorum, vel major quàm virentium.* Inſtead of *necui nectum*, the Teacher, if he pleaſe, may read, *enecui enectum*: for ſo the verſe will ſtand good too.

Fricui fric tum] *Frictum* is alſo by a *Syncope* from *fricatum* of *fricavi*: whence *fricatio, defricatus, perfricatus, infricatus, refricatwus.* Whereof ſee above in *As in Præſenti.*

Miſcui item miſtum] Of *miſcui* regularly is formed *miſcitum*, and of that, ſaith *Voſſius*, by a *Syncope* of *ci* is made *miſtum.* Some leaving out the *i* only, and tranſpoſing the *c* and *s* make thereof *mixtum*: *x* there being no more but *c* and *s*.

Ac amicui dat amictum] So you may ſay; unleſs you ſhall think better to ſay, that *amixi* makes *amictum*, as *Alvarus* doth, giving the Rule for it thus: *—dat amixit amictum*; or unleſs you think fit to form it by a *Syncope* of *i* from *amicitum*, as of *amicivi*.

Tenuique tentum] Hence (*viz.* from *tentum* of *tenco*) *in jure abſtenti dicuntur, qui auctoritate tutoris revocantur ab adeunda hæreditate*, ſaith *Voſſius* citing *Scævola, Papinian, Ulpian* for the uſe of the word. *De Analog.* l. 3. c. 24. Yet ſaith *Duiburgenſis* the Supine *abſtentum* is not in uſe: according to a memorial verſe; *Abſtineo nullum video retinere ſupinum*; the ſame we may ſay of *attineo*, and *pertineo*, which have no ſupines, according to both Mr. *Farnaby* and *Shirley*.

Conſului conſultum] The regular ſupine is *conſulitum*, but of that, now out of uſe, by a *Syncope* of *i* is made *conſultum*, ſaith *Voſſius*.

Alui altum alitumque] Of *alui* firſt was formed *a-*

litum regularly: and thence by a *Syncope* of *i*, *altum* of *alitum* is *alitus*, read in *Val Max.* l. 5. c. 4. *Quid tam in usitatum, quid tam inauditum, quàm matrem natæ uberibus alitam?* Of *altum* comes *altus* cited from *Sall.* by *Diomedes*, *Arpini altus*. *Diomedes* yet prefers *alitus*, for the avoiding of ambiguity, lest *altus fed*, should be confounded with *altus high*.

Colluí cultum] Of *coltum* by a *Syncope* of *i*, and a change of *o* into *u*, is made *cultum*.

Pinsui habet pistum] Of *pinsui* regularly is formed *pinsitum*. Thence *Colum.* l. 12. c. 27. hath, *Irim bene pinsitam nec plus unciæ pondere addito*. So *pinsitum panicum*, and *pinsitum hordeum* may be read in him. l. 2. c. 9. and l. 8. c. 4. Of *pinsitum* by the *Syncope* or taking out of [*it*] is made *pinsum*. Thence *Vitruv.* l. 7. c. 1. *Id non minus pinsum absolutum crassitudine dodrantii*. *Ib. Idque pinsum absolutum ne minus pedes sit crassum*. Of the same *pinsitum* again by casting out *n* and the middle *i* is made *pistum* Unless ye think rather to form it from *pisso*, which the Ancients, as *Diomedes* saith, used without *n*. Whence *Plin.* l. 8 c. 10. *Si pistæ ferantur*. And thence *pistor*, and *pistrinum*, saith *Vossius, de Analog.* l. 3. c. 31.

Seruique sertum] This simple supine is not now in use; yet it remains in the compounds and derivatives of it. Of which see above in *Rosit ui, sero seu*, &c. But thus much of the second Exception.

Qu. What is the third Exception of?

An. The third Exception is of some words; which from a preterperfect tense in *ui*, form a supine in *sum*, which according to our Author are these:

Hæc sed ui mutant in

Hæ sed ui mutant in sum: uim censeo censum
Colluí habet celsum; meto messui habet quoque messum;
Nexui item nexum, sic pexui habet quoque pexum,
Dat patui passum; carui cassum, caritumque.

In which *censui*, and *messui*, *nexui*, and *pexui* do form a supine in *sum*, not by changing of *ui* into *sum*, but *ui* into *um* after *s* already in the word, as *censui censum*.

censum, messui messum, where *s* is formally in: so *nexui nexum*, and *pexui pexum*, where *s* is eminently in: x standing for *c s*. But for *cellui*, there is no such simple verb as that: only *excello* hath *excellui*, and *præcello præcellui*, and thence by change of the latter *l* into *s* and then of *ui* into *um* is made *excelsum* and *præcelsum*. And for *patui*, it hath no supine: *passum* being the supine of *pandi*, not of *patui*. And *carui* though it form *cavitum*, according to the Rule, yet it doth not form *cassum*, according to this Exception.

¶ *Censeo censum*] That *censeo* makes *censum* is shewed as *Vossius* saith, by the verbals *census, censor, censura* ordinarily read, and by *censi* and *adcensi* noted by *Festus* in the old Authours; and by *recenso Senatu* said by *Sueton.* in *Vespasian*: (And so *Suetonius* indeed said, ib. c. 9. as *Stephanus*, from whom I suppose *Vossius* took it, reads the place, *Supplevitque recenso Senatu & equite*; though yet *Isaac Casaubon* reads it *recensito Senatu*) and it may be added by the Noun verbal *recensus*, which *Sueton.* in *Jul. Cæs.* c. 41. hath *Recensum populi, nec more, nec loco solito, sed vicatim per dominos insularum egit.* It may also be added, that, what this Authour saith in the same chapter, *Ex his qui recensiti non essent*, the Books of *Pithœus* and *Memmius* read *recensi*, as *Casaubon* notes. There is read also *recensitus*, as in the named place of *Sueton.* So in *Claud. Eutrop.* l. 2. *Prisca recensitis evolvite secula pensis.* But that is rather from *recensio* of the fourth Conjugation, as *Vossius, Alvarus*, and *Danesius* think. To which that makes somewhat, that *recensio* the Noun Verbal is read in the same place of *Sueton.* viz. *Jul. Cæs.* c. 41. *Ne qui novi cœtus recensionis causâ moveri quandoque possent, instituit.* *Vossius, de Analog.* l. 3. c. 24. *Danes. Schol.* l. 2. c. 13.

Cellui habet celsum] What is to be thought of this, see above in *cello pro frango cecidi*

Nexui item nexum] that such a supine as *nexum* is, or hath been in being, is evident from *nexus* the parti-

hath the same proof: and adds from *Julian* l. 21. *Digestor. Consilio & operâ curatoris tueri debet non solùm patrimonium, sed & corpus & salus furiosi.* Also an old *Inscription, Pareant ergo, & noscant omnes, Senatus & Populi Romani Imperium Deorum numine, & militum fortitudine & tueri, & regi.* To which let me ad this from *Saturnius* out of *Senec. l. de Morib. Omnes dies, velut ultimus, intueantur. Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 6.

A loquor adde locutus] This verbe both *Popma* and *Vossius* observe to be used passively by *Cælius* in his 8. Ep. to *Cicero, De damnatione ferventer loqui est cœptum.* I dare not stand by them in their observation, but leave it to others to consider of: but methinks *loqui est cœptum sc. ab illis*, is no more than *loqui cœperunt.*

Experior facit expertus] So *comperior*, as the *Gram.* of *Gryphiswal.* (fol. 51. a) saith, hath *compertus sum.* This indeed *Auson. Popma* l. 1. *de usu Antiq. Locut.* proves to be used in active sense, under a passive ending, and so to be a *Deponent*, from *Sall. Jug. Sed ego comperior Bocchum magis Punicâ fide, quàm ob ea quæ prædicabat, simul Romanos & Numidam spe pacis detinuisse.* So *Tacit. Historiar.* l. 4. *Gravem & sapientem virum fuisse comperior.* So *Appul. Apolog.* 1. *Ibi ego comperior omnes judices tanto poetæ adsurrexisse.* But *Vossius* denies it to have any other preterperfect tense but *comperi*, borrowed from *comperio*, saying *Compertus sum passivè sum tu, non activè*, unless in *Tertullian*, who *advers. Hermog.* c. 28. hath, *unde ergo compertus est Hermogenes informem & confusam illam [materiam] fuisse.* Id. l. 4. *adv. Marcion. Quo die (David) ipse compertus est veniam, jejunii dico.* But had it been found in any *Classic Authour*, *Stephanus* would have gone near to have found it: but He in his *Thesaurus*, in this active sense gives *comperior* no preterperfect tense. But that *opperior* (to be added hither also) hath *oppertus sum*, and in *Active* sense too, appears from *Ter. Phorm.* 3. 2. *Unam præterea horam ne oppertus sies.* For which *opperitus*

vitus is read in *Plaut. Mostell.* 3. 2. *seni otium non erat: id sum opperitus.* in whom also is read *opperibar. Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 33.

Formare pactiscor gaudet pactus sum] Hence *Suetor. de clar. Gram.* c. 7 *Nec usquam de mercedibus* (which in *Stephanus* through mistake is read *meritibus*) *pactus, eoque plura ex liberalitate discentium consecutus.* Hither add *depactiscor*, as some, or *depecticor*, as others would have it written. In *Ulpian* some Editions read *devactus*, some *depectus:* and thence is the difference *Alvarus* prefers the former, and so *Vossius*, as finding in *Cic.* l. 2. *de Invent. Depactus est cum eo, ut arma & impedimenta relinqueret. Vossius* by sundry instances shews *pactus* of *paciscor* to be used passively. *Tacit.* l. 2 *Annal. Silani filia Neroni, vetustissimo liberorum ejus pacta erat. Hor.* l. 3. od. 3. *Ex quo destituit Deos mercede pactâ Laomedon*, &c. And no wonder *paciscor* an active being read in *Nonius* out of *Nævius* b. Pun. l. 2. *Id quod paciscunt, ut mœnia sint, quæ Lutatium cenciliant. Id Captivos plurimos Siculienses pepigerit, obsides ut reddant. Voss. de Analog.* l. 3 c. 7 and 5. and 25. and *lib.* 4. c. 11. *Alvar.* p. 254 *Rhen.* p. 217.

Nancisco nactus] Of this *Saturnius* cites an example from *Lactant.* l. 6. *Si ducem nactus fuerit, qui dirigat ad meliora tituhantem.* So *Sall. Homines adulescentes summam potestatem nacti.* So *Ter. Ad. Pisces ex sententiâ nactus sum. Rhenius* saith it was anciently *nanctus sum ab antiquo nancio. Vossius* shews that it was *passively* taken in the preterperfect or participle rather, or that tense from *Hygin. Fab.* 1 *Occasione nactâ.* So *Fab.* 8. So *Apul.* l. 7. *Nactâ libertate, veris initio, pratis herbentibus, rosas utique reperturus aliquas. Saturn.* l. 1. c. 39. *Rhen.* p. 217. *Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 6.

Apiscor, quod Vetus est verbum aptus sum] This verb as *Saturnius* saith, is *perrarum quidem, Latinum tamen*; quoting for the use of it several Authours out of *Nonius Marcellinus. Auson. Popma* l. 1. *de usu Antiq. Locut.* c. 7 produceth diverse passages for it. *Plaut. in Epid.*

(and ye may find it, though he cite it not, in *Act.* 5. sc. 2.) *Tace jis modò siae me hominem apiſci.* So it may be found in *Rudent. Prol.* v. 17. *Qui hic litem apiſci poſtulant perjurio. Siſenna Hiſtoriar.* 3. *Itaque poſtero die legatos Iguvium reduntes apiſcitur. Lucret.* l. 1. v. 449. *Nec ratione animi quam quiſquam poſcit apiſci. Tacit. Annal.* 3. *Præbuit juveni materiam apiſcendi honoris.* lb. 6. *Nihil abnuentem, dum dominationis apiſceretur. Id. Hiſtoriar.* 4. *Intus ſumma apiſcendi libido. Id. Annal.* 5. *Jurius Gallio conſuerat, ut prætoriani, actis ſtipendiis, jus apiſcerentur in quatuordecim ordinibus ſedendi.* But the deſign of *Popma* in producing them is to ſhew, that the Ancients did caſt ſyllables out of the middle of words, and ſo to prove by ſo many inſtances, that *apiſcor* is put for *adipiſcor*. But ſure he did not then think of *indipiſcor*, read in *Plaut. Trin.* 2. 2. *Multum in cogitando dolorem indipiſcor*, and *Stich.* 4. 2. *Senex quidem voluit, ſi poſſet indipiſci de cibo.* And *Rud.* 5. 2. *Largiter mercedis indipiſcor. Gell.* l. 1. c. 11. *Sed enim Achaei Homerus pugnam indipiſci ait, non ſidicularum, tibiarumque concentu, ſed mentium animorumque conſtirati nitibundos. Id.* l. 17. c. 2. *Conabamur poſtea memoriæ vegetandæ gratiâ, indipiſci animo, ac recenſere quæ in libro ſcripta eſſent.* Elſe he would rather have thought *adipiſcor* compounded of *apiſcor* and *ad*, like *indipiſcor* of *apiſcor* and *in*, than that *apiſcor* was made of *adipiſcor* by a *Syncope* of *di* from the middle of it. Of the preterperfect *aptus eſt*, it may not be amiſs to give ſome examples. *Saturnius* cites one out of *Varro*, *Ea omnibus ſtendat, quæ bello aptus eſt. Plaut. Captiv.* 4. 1. hath, *Sine ſacris hæreditatem ſum aptus effertiſſimam. Voſſius* cites an *Epitaph* for *Plaut.* out of *Gell.* l. 1. c. 24. *Poſtquam eſt mortem aptus Plautus comœdia luget*: and reproves *Alciat* for reading it *captus*. But in my Book it is thus, *Poſtquam morte datus eſt Plautus.* He alſo quotes out of *Nonius Marcillin. Quod ego in acie crebro objectans vitam bellando aptus ſum.*

Made

Unde adipiſcor adeptus] *Adipiſcor* is ordinary. *Cic. 1. Offic. Qui adipiſci veram gloriam volunt, juſtitiæ fungantur officiis.* Thence *adeptus* in *Tacit.* l. 5. cited by *Saturnius, Servius Galba rerum adeptus eſt*, i. e. *potitus.* So *Cic. pro Clu. Summos a populo Romano honores eſt adeptus. Colum.* l. 5. c. 6. *Quum deinde arbor vetuſtatem fuerit adepta.* This verb hath anciently ſignified paſſively. Thence *Plaut. in Trin.* 2. 2. *Non ætate, verum ingenio adipiſcitur ſententia.* So *C. Fannius* cited by *Priſcian* l. 8. *Hæc adipiſcuntur*, i. e. ἐπιτυγχάνονται. & *Fab. Max. amitti magis, quàm adipiſci. Gell.* l. 18. cited by *Saturn. Nomine non adepto jam, ſed cum ſpe mox adipiſcendi. Sall. Jug. Prope jam adeptam victoriam retinere cupit. Boeth.* l. 3. *de Conſol.* c. 2. *Id autem eſt bonum, quo adepto, nihil ulterius deſiderari queat. Cic.* cited by *Pareus* in his *Lexic. Plaut. Adipiſcendi magiſtratus ſunt.* And no marvel, being there have been verbs in *o*, from whence theſe in *or* are formed. One I have now before my eye in *Plaut. Aſin.* 2. 2. v. 13. *Nunquam adepol quadrigis albis indipiſcet poſtea.* And *Stephanus* cites another from *Plaut. Aul.* 4. 10. *Neque partem tibi Ab eo, cui eſt, indipiſces* But my Book reads it, *Ab eo, quiqui eſt inde poſces. Alvar.* p. 254 *Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 6. & 25. *Rhen.* p. 216. *Saturn.* l. 6. c. 6. *Popma de uſu Antiq. Locut.* l. 1. c. 7.

Expergiſcor ſum experrectus] This verb is from the old *expergor*, and ſometimes it hath *experrectus*, and ſometimes *expergitus*: betwixt which two *Diomedes* makes this diſtinction, that *experrectus* notes one *wakened* out of his ſleep by another. Hence *Salluſt. Interdum ſomno experrectus, arreptis armis, tumultum facere.* But *expergitus* notes one ſatisfied with ſleep, and *awaking* of himſelf. Hence *Lucil. Ergo è ſomno pueros cum mane expergitus clamo.* I ſuppoſe this latter too old to be uſed.

Et hæc quoque comminiſcor commentus] From *meno*, (whence *memini* and *mentio*) comes *meniſcor*, and thence *comminiſcor*, and ſo *reminiſcor*, ſaith *Voſſius. Commentus* is in *Plaut. Trin.* Sc. ult. v. 24 *Megaronides*

communis hoc meus & tuus Benevolens commentu'st. Truc. 1. 1. *Eo nunc commenta est dolum.* It is needless to shew other tenses of it to be taken *actively*. That else of *Plaut Asin.* 1. 1 *Fabricare quidvis, quidvis comminiscere*, would do it. It hath been attempted to be proved to have also had the *passive* signification; and 'tis probable: Yet not so much by that of *Appius Cæcus*, cited from *Priscian* by *Vossius*; *Amicum cum vides obliviscere miserias. inimicus si es commentus nec libens æquæ* (which I understand not) as by that of *Plaut. Truc.* 2. 5. *Ædepol. commentum male.* Which *Pareus* quotes as an instance that *commentum* signifies *confictum*, and is taken παθετικῶς. *Lexic Plaut.* To which purpose he cites also that of *Plaut. Cistel.* 2 1. *Credo ego amorem primùm apud homines carnificinam commentum.* And if it have it, no wonder, when there may be read *comminisco* an Active in *Appul. Met.* 4. quoted by both *Popma* and *Vossius*, *Medium* (or as *Beroaldus* reads it, *remedium*) *e re natâ validum, eo volente comminiscimus. Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 6. and 39. *Popma de usu Antiq. Locut.* l. 1. c. 11

Nascor natus] From *Cato de* r. r. *Auson. Popma* brings in an instance, that *nasco* in the active form was anciently said. *Ubi germen nascere cœperit.* Thence was *nascitum*, and as from thence *nasciturus*, which *Portius Latro* in his declamation used. *Famam verò popularem a majoribus nostris sæpe numero accepimus, neque temere unquam nascituram esse, neque temere occasuram.* Thence the sacred Writers got it into use. But it is so rare, that *Phocas* said *nascor* had no such Participle belonging to it, as *Alvarus* notes. Yea saith *Saturnius*, *Nasciturus participium antiquis illis visum fuit adeo fugiendum, ut loco ejus nonnulli uti potius voluerint nascendus. Cujusmodi A. Gell.* l. 3. *Ad homines quoque nascendos.* And *Rhenius* quotes *Varro* and *Silius* for the same, but names no place. This verb *Saturnius*, and that upon second thoughts, doth plainly assevere to have a *Passive* signification, and because wherever

nascor

nascor is used, we may in stead of it use *gigner*. As in *cic.* 1. *Off.* *Quæ in terris gignuntur*, was said by *Cicero* for *nascuntur*. 'Tis the lesse to be wondred at, when we have seen before *nasco* an active. *Popma de usu Antiq. Locut.* l. 1. c. 11. *Voss. Etymolog.* p. 112. *Alvar.* p. 225. *Rhen.* p. 273. *Saturn. Merc. Maj.* l. 1. c. 41.

Moriorque mortuus] This verb anciently hath been of the fourth Conjugation. Hence in *Priscian* l. 9. *Ennius* 14. *Annal.* hath, *Nobis ostendat, si vivimus sive morimur.* And *Ter. Eun* 3. 1. *Risa omnes qui aderant, emoriri. Plaut. Asin.* 1. 1. v. 108. *Moriri sese misere mavelet, Quàm non perfectum reddat, quod promiserit.* It looks somewhat like a passive in those passages which *Saturn.* cites out of *Cic. ad C. Cass. D. Syllam alii mortuum a latronibus, alii cruditate dicebant.* And *Lucan.* l. 10. *Quis nolit ab isto Ense mori.* But it is but like one: as *patior*, when it is said, *Mundus a se patitur*; or *calesco*, when it is said, *Anima calescit ab ipso spiritu*; or *occido*, when it is said, *Occidit a foti, sic Dii voluistis, Achille. Mortuus* some will have a noun: but they are deceived, saith *Vossius*, in as much as it is not only declined with case, but together with the *thing* signifies *time*, as in that of *Cic.* before mentioned, *D. Syllam*, &c. The participle of the future in *rus moriturus*, used in *Virgil*, *Quo moritare ruis?* is formed as from the supine *moritum*, which yet is not to be found in any extant Authour, that I know of. *Saturn. Merc. Major.* l. 1. c. 40. *Voss. Anal.* l. 4. c. 10. *Etymolog.* p. 124.

Atque orior quod præteritum facit ortus] This verb is one of those, that partake of the formations of diverse conjugations: and have some terminations of both the third and the fourth. *Oriri* of the fourth it hath alwaies, but never *ori* of the third. Again, *Oĕris, oritur, orimur*, it hath, if not alwaies, yet more usually, than the same persons of the Fourth. *Ovid. Met.* l. 10. *Tu quoties ortis viridique in cespite flores. Ovid.* 1. *Fast. Prosperæ lux oritur.* As from *oritum* it hath *oriturus. Hor.* l. 2.

ep. 1. *Nil orituruṁ alias, nil ortum tale fatentes.* So of *oritum* by a *Syncope* made *ortum* it hath *ortus*. Whence *Cic. pro Clu. Quum quædam in callibus (ut solet) controversia pastorum esset orta.* From this verb comes *oriundus*, by an *Antiſtæchon* for *oriendus* which though it hath the termination of a participle of the future tenſe, yet hath the ſignification of the preterperfect tenſe, moſt an end, if not alwaies. *Plaut. Pœn.* 5. 2. *Nam haud repudio hoſpitium, neque Carthaginem, Inde ſum oriundus. Plin.* (or *Suet.*) *de viris Illuſtribus.* c. 35. *Pyrrhus rex Epirotarum materno genere ab Achille, paterno ab Hercule oriundus.* Hither may be referred *adorior* compounded of *orior*, as that which ſomewhat follows the ſimple verb. Hence as *Sall. in fug. Ne quo ſeditio aut bellum oriretur, anxius erat*; So *Liv.* l. 1. *ab urbe Timor inceſſit, ne vis aliqua externa civitatem adoriretur. Lucil.* l. 3. in *Priſcian. Conturbare animam potis eſt quicunque adoritur.* So *Lucret.* l. 3. *Commutare animam quicunque adoritur & inſit.* And as *Ovid.* 4. *Faſt.* ſaith, *Sylvis fuit ortus in altis*: So *Ter. Ad.* 3. 3. *Adortus jurgio fratrem.* This participle *Voſſius* from *Priſcian* l. 8. cites *Aurelius* uſing paſſively, *Ab his Gallos adortos, ex inſidiis plurimos necatos.* The participle in *dus*, is *adoriendus*, not *adoriundus*, that I can find. *Cic. ad Heren. Occaſio queritur, Idoneane ſatis fuerit ad rem adoriendam, an alia melior. Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 6. and 35.

Qu. How are the words of this Rule declined?

The declining of the words.

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus:

Labor, ĕris vel ĕre, lapſus ſum vel fui, labi, lapſum.
Patior, ĕris vel ĕre, paſſus ſum vel fui, pati, paſſum
[*Compatior, ĕris v. ĕre, compaſſus ſ. v. f. compati, compaſſum*]
Perpetior, ĕris vel ĕre, perpeſſus ſ. vel f. perpeti, perpeſſum
Fateor, ĕris vel ĕre, faſſus ſ. vel f. fateri, faſſum.
Confiteor, ĕris, vel ĕre, confeſſus ſ. vel f. confiteri, confeſſum.
Diffiteor, ĕris vel ĕre diffeſſus ſ. vel f. diffiteri, diffeſſum
Gradior, ĕris vel ĕre, greſſus, &c. gradi, greſſum.
Digredior, ĕris vel ĕre, digreſſus, &c. digredi, digreſſum.

Fatiſcor,

Fatiſcor, ĕris *velĕre*, [*feſſus*, &c.] *fatiſci*, [*feſſū*]
Metior, iris, &c. *menſus*, &c. *metiri*, *menſum*,
uter, uteris, &c. *uſus*, &c. *uti*, *uſum*,
Oraior, *ordiris*, &c. *orſus*, &c. *ordiri*, *orſum*,
Niter, ĕris, &c. *niſus & nixus*, &c. *niti*, *niſum & nixum*
ulciſcor, ĕris, &c. *ultus*, &c. *ulciſci*, *ultum*,
Iraſcor, ĕris, &c. *iratus*, &c. *iraſci*, *iratum*,
Reor, reris, &c. *ratus*, &c. *reri*, *ratum*,
Obliviſcor, ĕris, &c. *oblitus*, &c. *oblivīſci*, *oblitum*,
Fruor, ĕris, &c. *fructus & fruitus* &c. *frui*, *fructū & fruitū*
Miſereor, ĕris, &c. *miſertus*, &c. *miſereri*, *miſertum*,
Tuor, tuĕris, &c. *tuitus ſum*, &c. [*tui*] *tutum*,
Tueor, tuēris, &c. *tuitus*, &c. *tueri*, *tuitum*,
Loquor, ĕris, &c. *locutus*, &c. *loqui*, *locutum*,
Sequor, eris, &c. *ſecutus*, &c. *ſequi*, *ſecutum*,
Experior, īris, &c. *expertus*, &c. *experiri*, *expertum*,
Paciſcor, ĕris, &c. *pactus*, &c. *paciſci*, *pactum*,
Nanciſcor, ĕris, &c. *nactus*, &c. *nanciſci*, *nactum*,
Apiſcor, ĕris, &c. *aptus*, &c. *apiſci*, *aptum*,]
Adipiſcor, ĕris, &c. *adeptus*, &c. *adipiſci*, *adeptum*,
Queror, ĕris, &c. *queſtus*, &c. *queri*, *queſtum*,
Proficiſcor, ĕris, &c. *profectus*, &c. *proficiſci*, *profectum*
Expergiſcor, eris, &c. { *experrectus* [*expergitus*] } *expergiſci*, *experrectum*,
Comminiſcor, ĕris, &c. *commentus*, &c. *comminiſci*, *commentum*
Naſcor, ĕris, &c. *natus*, &c. *naſci*, *natum*,
Morior, ĕris, &c. *mortuus*, &c. *mori*,

Orior, { *orĕris* / *oriris* } &c. *ortus*, &c. *oriri*, *ortum*.

Qu. **May there any other verbs be added hither?**

An. Of *regular* verbs there may be added many of all conjugations: but of *irregular* ones, not many, yet some: as *divertor*, *prævertor*, *revertor*, which have *diverti*, *prævertī*, and *reverti* in their preterperfect tenſe; *aſſentior* which hath *aſſenſus ſum*; and *potior* which hath

potitus

potitus sum, and is found used sometimes as a verb of the *Third* conjugation, and sometimes as of the *Fourth*.

¶ Of *Potior* used as a verb of the *third* conjugation these instances there are. *Virg.* 3. *Æn. Polydorum obtruncat, & auro Vi potitur. Ovid.* 3. *Fast. Mars videt hanc, visamque cupit, potiturque cupitâ. Ovid. Met.* 13. v. 130. *Tuque tuis armis, nos te poteremur Achille.* And so of its use as a verb of the *fourth* conjugation, these instances there are cited by *Vossius* from *Lucil. Desitit alma Ceres, nec plebes pane potitur*, and from *Nævius* or *Lævius* l. 2. *Iliad. Fecundo penetrat penitus, thalamoque potitur. Gell.* l. 9. *Macedones gentium, nationumque multarum potiri cœperant. Plaut. Rud.* 1. 3. *Nam hoc mihi haud labore est laborem hunc potiri. Cic. de Fin. b. Cleanthes solem dominari, & rerum potiri putat Id. Ep. Si exploratum tibi sit, posse te illius regni potiri.* Yet saith *Vossius*, in *infinitivo semper est quarta*. That this verb is taken *passively* sometimes, is the opinion of great Criticks. *Potiri hostium mira phrasi dicitur* saith *Pareus* in his *Lex. Plautin.* citing *Plaut. Epid.* a. 4 Sc. 1. *Gnata mea hostium potita est.* ib. v. 35. *Mu. Filiam quam ex te suscepi. Pe. Quid eam? Mu. Eductam perdidi, Hostium est potita. Id. Capt.* 1. 1. v. 24. *Nam postquam meus rex est potitus hostium.* That of *Ter. in Phor.* 3. 1. v. 5. *Ne quid propter tuam fidem deceptus potiretur quid mali*, was anciently *potieretur*, as *Donatus* saith; and *Janus Gulielmius* calls them miserable Criticks (*nælli miseri critici sunt &c.*) who could not follow so good an Authour. By the phrase *potiri mali*, as *Pareus* expounds it, is meant *opprimi a malo, & in ejus tanquam potestatem venire*. In this sense *Cic.* 1. *Tusc.* puts *potitur fatorum* for *moritur*. Hence *Trypho* in *Nonius* l. *de bello, Tit. de Captivis & postliminio reversis. Cætera quæ in jure sunt, postea quam postliminio redit, pro eo habentur, ac si nunquam ille hostium potitus fuisset.* And *Papinian. Exinde sui juris videtur fuisse, ex quo pater hostium potitus est.* See *Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 6. and 35. *Pareus Lex. Plaut. voce Potiri. Schrevel.*

in *Ter. Phorm.* 3. 1. *Saturn. Merc. Major.* l. 1. c. 37.

And thus far of the Rules for the preterperfect tenſes and ſupines of Regular Verbs.

CHAP. XII.

Qu. WE have done with the *Regular* verbs, and are now come to the *Irregular* ones, **Tell me, how many ſorts of them there be?**

An. Of irregular verbs there be three ſorts, *Redundants, Variants, Defectives.*

Qu. **What is the Rule for the Redundant Verbs?**

An. For the verbs that are Redundant there is this Rule.

De verbis geminum præteritum habentibus viz. Activæ & Paſſivæ vocis.

Præteritum activæ & paſſivæ vocis habent hæc, ſeno cœnavi & cœnatus ſum tibi format; juro, juravi & juratus, &c.

Præteritum activæ & paſſivæ vocis

Qu. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That there be ſome verbs, which have two preterperfect tenſes, the one of the Active, and the other of the paſſive form: as *placeo placui placitus; nubo nupſi nupta ſum; libet libuit libitum; licet licuit licitum; tædet pertæduit pertæſum; pudet puduit puditum*; and *piget piguit pigitum.*

¶ *Præteritum activæ & paſſivæ vocis*] By *paſſive voice* we are to underſtand ſometimes only the *paſſive form*, and not alwaies the paſſive *ſignification*: for though the *ſignification* be much according to the *form*, yet ſometime the *ſignification* is *active*, when the *form* is *paſſive*.

Cœno

Cœno cœnavi & cœnatus sum tibi format] *Cœnavi* is in *Cic. Qu. Fr.* l. 2. ep. 8. *Eo die cœnavi apud Crassipedem. Id. in Vatin. Quis in funere familiari cœnavit cum togâ pullâ. Cœnatus* is in *Cic. de Invent. Cœnati discubuerunt ibidem.* But *Cœnavi* and *cœnatus sum* are not in every point the same. For we may not say *cœnatus sum apud te*, but *cœnavi* only: at *Plaut. Amph.* 2. 2. *Mecum cœnavisti. Cœnatus* (as *Vossius* and *Alvarus* say) hath place, when we say what one did, or had done to him, when, or after that he had supped. *Cic.* 1. *de Divin. Qui cum cœnati quiescerent. Cic. pro Deiot. Quum illa munera inspexisset cœnatus. Horat.* 1. *Serm.* 10. *Satyr. Amet scripsisse ducentos Ante cibum versus totidem cœnatus. Sall. in Jugurth. Consilium adprobat, ac statim milites cœnatos esse in castris, ignesque creberrimos fieri. Cic. Att.* l. 2. ep. 16. *Cœnato mihi & jam dormitanti epistola illa reddita est.* And perhaps whilst he supped. As in that of *Cornel. Nepos in vita Attici. Neque unquam sine aliquâ lectione apud eum cœnatum est. Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 21. *Alvar.* pag. 236, 237.

Juro juravi & juratus] *Juratus sum* seems used sometimes for *juravi. Plaut. Curc.* 4. 4. *Quod fui juratus feci.* ib. 2. 3. v. 88. *Quid quod juratus sum? Id. Persa.* 3. 2. *Qui mihi juratus est sese hodie argentum dare. Gell.* 7. 18. *Statimque ut jurati erant ad Annibalem profecti sunt. Plaut. Rud.* 5. 2. v. 16, 17. *Non tu juratus mihi es? Juratus sum, & nunc jurabo.* Yet *juratus sum* is not the preterperfect of *juro*, but of *juror*, read in *Lucan. & Stat.* observed, not by *Vossius* alone, as himself acknowledgeth. *De Analog.* l. 3. c. 21. *Joan. Tistin. Comment. in Ciceron. pro Cecin.* p. 175.

Potoque potavi & potus] *Potavi* is alwaies taken *actively*: *potus* sometimes, if we will believe *Rhenius*. But no example of it have we in him, or any else, that I find; and therefore I conclude it taken alwaies either *Passively*, or *Neutrally*. *Passively* as in *Ovid.* 1. *Fastor. Quo plus sunt potæ, plus sitiuntur aquæ. Id. Met.* 15. *Nocte nocent potæ, sine noxâ luce bibuntur.*

Cic.

Cic. de Clar. Orator. Sanguine tauri poto mortuus concidit Themistocles. Neutrally in these *Cic. pro Mil. Adde inscitiam pransi, poti, oscitantis ducis. Ovid. 3. Fastor. Senem potum pota trahebat anus. Cic. Fam.* l. 7. ep. 22. *Etsi domum bene potus seroque redieram, tamen*— And so *Saturnius* saith of the two former, *Quæ ego potius absoluta existimaverim, quam transitiva.* In a word, of whomsoever it may be said *potus est*, of him it may be said *potavit*: but whether of whomsoever it may be said *potavit*, of him it may be said *potus est*; let the sober Reader judge. If not, then is not *potus sum* the preterperfect of *poto Rhen.* p. 269. *Saturn.* l. 6. c. 5. *Voss. Analog.* l. 3. c. 21. *Alvar.* p. 236, 237.

Titubo titubavi vel titubatus] *Titubavi* is alwaies used *actively*: but *Titubatus* either *passively*, as *Cic.* 3. *de Orat. Versus debilitatur in quacunque ejus sit parte titubatum. Id in ep. Si quid forte titubatum est, ut in bello. Id. Si tantulum offensum titubatumque sit.* Or *Neutrally*, as *Virg.* 5. *Æn. Hic juvenis jam victor orans vestigia presso Haud tenuit titubata solo*, i. e. *quæ titubaverant.*

Sic careo carui & cassus sum] *Cassus* is a noun, and not a participle: nor will it be easie to find where any one said *cassus sum* for *carui*. So that till Authority be produced for it, the continnance of this in his Grammar seems to be a mistake in the learned *Jasz. Berengi.* See before *Carui, cassum, caritumque.*

Prandeo, prandi, & pransus] *Pransus* is not the same that *prandi*: but signifies *qui prandit, vel confecto prandio, vel a prandio*, as *Alvarus, Farnaby* and *Nonius Marcellinus* think: and like *cœnatus*, hath place, when we declare what one doth, or suffereth, or how one is affected, after that he hath dined; as *Cic. pro Mil. Vide inscitiam pransi, poti oscitantis ducis.* Nor as *Plaut.* said in *Pœn. Calidum prandium prandisti*, would any one say *Calidum prandium pransus es.* Nor would *Vossius* say *pransus sum apud te*; but *prandi*: and again

pran-

pransus ad te accedam. See before *Cœno & poto*. And *Alvar*. p. 236, 237, 239, *Voss. de Analog*. l. 3. c. 21.

Pateo patui & passus] But we have shewed before, that *passum* is not from *pateo*, but from *pando*: and *passus sum* is the preterperfect of *pandor*, not of *pateo*. If *Jasz-Berengi*, who espouses this, shall give us his Authour for it, he will then give us cause to free both himself, and our *Authour* from imputation of mistake.

Placeoque dat placui & placitus] *Placui* and *placitus sum* are very near, if not all out, the same in sense. *Ter. Hecyr. Prol. ubi sunt cognitæ, placitæ sunt*. i. e. *placuerunt*. *A. Gell*. l. 1. cited by *Saturn*. l. 1. c. 27. *Statim displicita est insolentia*, *Ovid*. *Non ita diis placuit*. *Plaut*. *Amph*. *Ita diis placitum*. *Quintil*. *Pueros adulescentibus sedere permixtos non placet mihi*. So *Saturnius* cites it from him. *Hor*. l. 2. *Od*. 17. *Sic potenti justitiæ placitumque Parcis*. But yet *placitus sum* can hardly be said to be the preterperfect tense of *placeo*, if such a word as *placeor* be read. And such a word *Saturnius* quotes from St. *Cyprian*, who in his *Ep*. laid, *Si hominibus placetur*, *dominus offendatur*. Suitable to what *Seneca* said, *Ab his nihil divinitati nocetur*. Notwithstanding because this word is, as *Saturnius* saith, *perinde rarum*, *ut nusquam alibi reperiatur*, if it shall not be allowed of (so willing am I to find no more faults in our Authour, of any else, than needs must be) let *placitus sum* go for a preterperfect tense of *placeo*, if it please you. And however with *Vossius* and *Saturnius*, let the Impersonal *placet* have *placuit*, and *placitum est*; which perhaps is that, and all that our Authour here meant. *Saturn*. l. 1. c. 14.

Suesco suevi atque suetus] *Suevi* and *suetus* may agree much in sense and use, but neither of them is from *sueso*. But *suevi* is from *sueo*, used by *Lucret*. l. 1. *Et femina rerum Appellare suemus*; i. e. *solemus*. *Ib*. *Nec frigora quimus ut surpare oculis, nec voces ire*

nere fuemus. And thence *fuesco* borrows the preterperfect *fuevi.* And *fuetus sum* is, if not from *fuevo*, no such word being read, yet from *fuesco*, whereof in *Liv.* l. 2. is read *assuescor. Charitasque ipsius soli, eum longo tempore assuescitur, animos eorum consociasset.* Whence I suppose the *Gryphisw. Grammar* hath not *fuesco*, but *assuesco, assuevi* and *assuetus sum.* p. 53.

Veneo pro vendor, venivi venditus & sum] *Venivi*, or rather *venii* (as Grammarians love to speak) and *venditus sum* may in sense agree, yet they are preterperfect tenses of two several verbs, *venivi* or *venii* of *veneo*, and *venditus sum* of *vendor.* And I cannot understand why *Jasz. Berengi* or any other should give to a verb a preterperfect tense more than it needs, or hath.

Nubo nupsi nuptaque sum] *Nuptus sum.* I find not read in any Author, but *nupta sum*, nor scarce in any Grammarian, but *Saturnius* and *Jasz. Berengi*, thence I suppose our Author changes the gender of the participle. But in sense I see no difference between *nupsi* and *nupta sum. Cic.* 1. *Divin. Virgo nupsit illi, cui Cæcilia nupta fuerat. Cic. pro Cluent. Quæ brevi tempore post patris mortem A. Aurio Melino consobrino suo nupsit. Plaut. Amph.* 2. 2. *Quid ego deliqui, si cui nupta sum, tecum fui. Cic. Fam.* 15. 3. *Quotum esset nupta regis Armeniorum soror. Id.* l. 2. *de Orat. quo cum* (if *Saturnius* quote it right) *nupta erat matertera nostra. Plaut. Trin.* 1. 2. *Dum quidem hercle tecum nupta sit, sanè velim. A. Gell.* l. 1. *ut una apud duos nupta esset. Cic. pro Cæl. Cum ex amplissimo genere in familiam clarissimam nupsisses. Tacit.* l. 1. *Julia denupsit in domum Rubellii.* But this verb is used not of *women* only, but of *men* too, yet womanish men most an end, if not always. *Martial.* l. 12. *Barbatus rigido nupsit Callistratus Afro. Hâc quâ legitimo nubere virgo solet. Id.* l. 8. ep. 12. *Uxori nubere nolo meæ. Juven. Sat.* 2. *Quid quæris? nubit amicus. Pomponius Pannuceatis in Nonius, sed meus major*

frater

frater nupſit dotatæ vetulæ. Hence *Chalinus* in *Plaut. Caſin.* 5. 1. is called *nuptus. Lubet Chalinum, quid agat ſcire, novum nuptum cum novo marito.* And when it is that a *man* is married to a *man* which is againſt nature, it may not be unfit to ſay of that man, *nuptus eſt*, though that be againſt uſe; which perhaps thoſe two very learned Grammarians above-mentioned had reſpect unto. Yet is not *nuptus* or *nupta ſum* the preterperfect of *nubo*, but of *nubor*: which is read in *Plaut. Perſ.* 3. 1. *Non tu nunc hominum mores vides. Quojuſmodi hic cum famâ facile nubitur? Dum dos ſit, nullum vitium vitio vertitur.* If that may not be allowed of, then we may ſay with *Voſſius* too as well as our Authour, *Nubo facit nuptæ, & nupta ſum. Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 25. *Saturn. Merc. Maj.* l. 1. c. 27. *Rhen.* p. 269. *Alvar.* p. 244.

Mereor meritus ſum vel merui] *Meritus ſum* and *merui* may agree in ſenſe: but as *meritus ſum* is of *mereor*, ſo *merui* is of *mereo*: for that verb is read in *Plaut. Menæch.* 2. 3. *Item huic ultro fit, ut merer, potiſſimum noſtræ domi ut ſit. Ib.* 5. 7. *Adibo, atque hominem accipiam, quibus dictis merer. Id. Moſtell.* 1. 1. *Quia nunquam merui, tu meruiſti, & nunc meres.* So in *Plaut. Pſeud.* 4. 7. is read *demereo*: *Quid mercedis petaſus hodie domino demeret? A. Gell.* l. 1. c. 8. *Grandem pecuniam demerebat. Suet. in Aug. Avunculum magnopere demeruit.* i. e. *devinxit*, ſaith *Saturnius.* So *Promereo* is in *Plaut. Trin.* 3. 2. *Nam retineri nequeo, quin dicam ea, quæ promeres. Ter. And.* 2. 1. *Neutiquam officium liberi eſſe hominis puto, cum is nihil promereat, poſtulare id gratiæ apponi ſibi.*

Adde libet, libuit, libitum] So *Saturnius.* l. 3. c. 23. and *Voſſius Etymolog.* p. 137. and *Alvar.* p. 242. *Libuit* is read in *Ter. Eun.* 4. 7. as *Stephanus* quotes it, and *Farnaby* reads it. *Et cum eo clam ſubdixiſti te mihi? Libuit, Schrevelius* reads it *lubuit.* So in *Plaut. Pſeud.* 1. 3. *Cur id auſus facere? Libuit, mea fuit.* So *Stephanus*

reads

reads it: *Plantin, lubuit. Libitum eſt* is neer the ſame in ſenſe with it. *Ter. Ad.* 5. 1. *Prodeambulare huc libitum eſt. Plaut. Curc.* 5. 2. *Quid iſtum tibi tactio eſt? Quia mihi libitum eſt. Plaut. Bacch.* 5. 1. *Is me ſcelus uſque attondit dolis doctis, indoctum ut libitum eſt.* Where *libitum eſt* hath the perfect ſenſe of the preter-perfect tenſe. *Plaut. Mil.* 3. 2. *Quî libitum eſt illi condormiſcere? Cic.* 2. *de Leg. Quoniam libitum eſt vobis me ad hæc impellere.*

Et licet adde quod licuit licitum] *Quintil.* l. 4. c. 4. hath *licuit. Procuratorem tibi eſſe non licuit. Cic. pro Flac. Hanc te capere non licuit. Cic. Att.* l. 2. *Nihilo magis ei liciturum eſſet plebeio remp. perdere quam ſimilibus ejus me conſule patriciis licitum eſſet. Id. in Fam. Quibus ſine dolore licitum eſt mortem cum vitâ commutare. Id. Antiq. in Exil. Dum in civitate manere licitum eſt.* So that here alſo we may ſay with *Voſſius*, *Saturnius*, and *Alvarus*, as well as our own Authour, *Alicet venire licuit, & licitum eſt ſatis conſtat.* One thing by the way I obſerve, that *eſt* is more uſed with *licitum*, and *libitum*, than *fuit. Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 22. *Saturn.* l. 3. c. 23.

Tædet quod tæduit & dat pertæſum] So *Voſſius* in his *Etymolog.* p. 137. as well as our Authour. *Tædet* is in *Cic. Att.* l. 5. *Tædet omnes nos vitæ. Ter. Eun.* 1. 1. *Et tædet, & amore ardeo. Id. Phorm.* 3. 2. *At enim tædet jam audire eadem millies. Plaut. Caſin.* 1. 1. *Tædet ſermonis tui. Tædebat* is in *Ter. Ad.* 1. 1. *Credo jam omnium tædebat. Tædeat in Cic.* 2. *Verr. ſunt homines quos libidinis & infamiæ ſuæ neque pudeat, neque tædeat. Pertæſum eſt in Virg. Æn.* 5. —*Et quos Pertæſum magni incepti rerumque tuarum eſt. Id. Æn.* 4 *Si non pertæſum thalami tædæque fuiſſet. Plaut. Moſtell.* 1. 4. *Ita me ibi male convivii ſermoniſque pertæſum eſt.* But this *tæduit* I cannot find. Hence I ſuppoſe both *Rhenius* and *Saturnius*, and *Hayn* decline this verb *tædet* only with *pertæſum eſt.* And ſo *Alvarus*: *tantum tædet vel potius pertædet pertæſum eſt.* And yet *Saturnius* from

pertædeo cites *pertæduissent* out of *A. Gell.* l. 1. *Verbis ejus defatigati pertæduissent.* Thence doubtless Mr. *Farnaby* instead of *tædet* hath *pertædet, pertæsum & pertæsum est.* And so *Linacer. & a tædet, vel potius pertædet pertæsum est.* He had said that some (and he names this amongst the rest) had a double preterperfect tense given to them; therefore giving this for one, he allows *tæduit* or rather *pertæduit* for the other. If therefore we shall allow our Author (and why may we not?) to set down *tæduit* by an *Aphæresis* for *pertæduit*, he may be as right as the best; *tæduit* the simple being no more in use, than *tæsum*, for which we use the compound *pertæsum*, and so may *pertæduit*, for ought I know. *Jasc. Berengi* hath *tæditum est*: but I know no Author for that. *Voss. Etymolog.* p. 137 *Farnab.* p. 37. *Linacer de Emendat. Struct.* l. 4. p. 179. *Saturn.* l. 4. c. 25. *Hayae* p. 76. *Rhen.* p. 258. *Alvar.* p. 242.

Adde pudet faciens puduit puditumque] So *Farnaby*, and *Vossius*, *Rhenius*, and *Alvarus*. *Puduit* is in *Sil.* l. 10. *Mens abiit, puduitque fugæ. Puditum est* in *Plaut. Baceh.* 3. 1. *Neque mei, neque te tui intus puditum est factis, quæ facis. Appul. in Apolog. Nonne vos puditum est hæc crimina tali viro objectare? Cic. pro Flac. Nonne esset puditum, si hanc causam agerem severè. Plaut. Casin.* 5. 2. v. 4. *Pudet quòd prius non puditum unquam est.* Indeed *Saturnius* saith, *Jam verò pigitum est, & puditum est, pro piguit & puduit, jam quis inter verba recepit?* l. 3. *Metr. Maj.* c. 25.

Atque piget tibi quod formas piguit, pigitumque] So *Farnaby*, *Vossius*, *Rhenius*, *Alvarus*. *Pigit* seems no ordinary word. *Stephanus* cites *Columella* l. 6. c. 1. for it. *Caterum de tam sapiente viro pigait dicere.* But in the Author, at least in my Book, it is, and as it seems should be, *piget*. But indeed *Cic. contr. Sall.* (if that be *Cicero's*) it is read. *Neque piguit quærere, cur ego P. Crassi bonum emissem. Pigitum* is in *Sil.* l. 7. *Nec pigitum est parvos-*

parvoſque lares humiliſque ſubire. Limina cœlicolam tecti. So *Gell.* l. 13. cited by *Saturnius*, *Pigitum eſt cinctos ſaltem eſſe & penulatos. Id.* 15. 13. *Veritum autem, ſicut puditum & pigitum, non perſonaliter per inſinitum modum dictum eſſe non a vetuſtioribus tantùm videmus. Farnab.* p. 37. *Alvar.* p. 242. *Voſſ. Etym.* p. 187. *Analog.* l. 4. c. 13. *Rhen.* p. 259. *Saturn. Merc. Maj.* c. 25.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus: The declining of the words.

Cano, cœnas, cœnavi, cœnare, cœnatum;
Juvo, juvas, juvavi, juvare, juvatum,
Voto, votas, votavi, votare, votatum & votum,
Titubo, titubas, titubavi, titubare, titubatum,
Careo, cares, carui, carere, caritum,
Prandeo, prandes, prandi, prandere, pranſum,
Placeo, places, placui & placitus ſum, placere, placitum,
Patco, pates, patui, patere ——
Sueſco, ſueſcis, ſuevi, ſueſcere, ſuetum,
Veneo, venis, venii, venire,
Nubo, nubis, nupſi, [& nuptus ſum] nubere, nuptum,
Mereor, mereris, meritus ſum, mereri, meritum,
Mereo, meres, merui, mererc, meritum,
Libet, libebat, libuit & libitum eſt, libere,
Licet, licebat, licuit & licitum eſt, licere,
Tædet, tædebat, pertæduit & pertæſum eſt, tædere,
Pudet, pudebat, puduit & puditum eſt, pudere,
Piget, pigebat, piguit & pigitum eſt, pigere.

Qu. **Are there any other words of like nature, that may be added hither?**

An. Of like nature to the words in this Rule ſome other words are accounted to be, which may be referred hither: as *punio punivi & punitus ſum; doleo dolui & dolitus ſum; cenſeo cenſui & cenſus ſum; queo quis quivi & quitus ſum; odio* (out of uſe) *odi & oſus ſum; deſino, deſivi & deſitus ſum.*

¶ The active preterperfect tenſes of theſe verbs are

not doubted of: those of the passive form, though of Active signification follow. Of *punitus sum* we have an instance in *Cic. pro Mil. Cujus tu inimicissimum multo crudeliùs etiam punitus es, quàm erat humanitatis meæ postulare. Punitus es*, i. e. *punivisti*, saith *Barthol. Latomus Schol. in loc.* This 'tis like *Quintillian* had in his Eye, when in his l. 9. c. 3. he set down that figure of speech, *Inimicos punitus es.* And no doubt but *Appul.* followed, in his l. 8. when he said, *Punita sum nefarium meorum nuptiarum prædonem.* Yet in strictness though *punitus sum* be used to signifie the same that *punii*, it is not a preterperfect of *punio*, and so *punio* (though *Vossius* hemself give it, that *punio etiam apud Tullium puni & punitus sum facit*) is no Redundant, but it is a preterperfect of *punior*, which in other tenses also, beside the preterperfect tense, was used Deponently in an active sense, as *Auson. Popma* l. 1. *de Antiq. Locut.* c. 11. sheweth. *Cic. Tusc.* 1. *Multi inimicos etiam mortuos puniuntur. Id. de Offic.* l. 1. *Neque ad ejus qui punitur aliquem, aut verbis castigat, sed ad reipublicæ utilitatem referri. Id. Phil.* 8. *Clarissimorum hominum crudelissimam puniretur necem.*

That *doleo* hath *dolui* and *dolitus sum* is *Saturnius* his observation: and he proves it three times over, p. 57. and 69. and 281. Yet all with *one proof* out of *A. Gell.* l. 9. c. 13. *Id subito perdolitum est cuidam Tito Manlio summo genere nato*—which are the words of *Claud. Quadrigarius* there related by *Gellius.*

That *censeo* hath *census sum* beside *censui* is thought because of that of *Ovid.* l. 1. *de Pont.* El. 3. *Hanc probat & primo dilectum semper ab ævo, Est inter comites martia cense suos.* But if *censeor* have not been a Deponent, as *Stephanus* and his followers say, but supposed by *Vossius* to be mistaken, yet this like the other of *perdolitum est*, is but an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, no news of it elsewhere, that I hear of, but in *Cic. pro Flac.* where there is at least in the opinion of *Vossius*, a false cric of it, See *Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 5.

That

That *queo* makes not *quivi* only, but *quitus ſum* is thought, becauſe of that of *Gellius* l. 20. c. 1. *Sævitia iſta pœnæ contemni non quita eſt.* And that of *Ter. Hec.* 4. 1. v. 57. *Nam quum compreſta eſt gnata, forma in tenebris noſci non quita eſt.* But *Saturnius*, *Rhenius*, and *Voſſius* too, tell us that *queatur* is read in *Lucret.* l. 1. for *queat.* And ſo 'tis v. 1043. *Dum veniant aliæ ac ſupleri ſumma queatur.* And I am ſure in *Plaut. Perſ.* 2. 2. v. 12. is read *queantur. Nec ſubigi queantur unquam, ut pro eâ fide habeant judicem. Appul. in Apolog.* hath *nequitur. Sola virginitas, cum ſemel accepta eſt, reddi nequitur. Plaut. Rud.* 4. 4. v. 20. *Vt nequitur comprimi!* And then *quitus ſum* may ſignifie the ſame that *quivi*, but it will not be a Redundant preterperfect of *queo*, but the right preterperfect of *queor* uſed Deponently.

As there is *odi* by a *Syncope* put for *odivi* (uſed by *M. Anton.* in his letters recited in *Cicero*'s *Philip.* 13.) of the obſolete verb *odio*, yet uſed by St. *Hierome*, So there is *oſus ſum* alſo read in *active* ſignification. *Plaut. Amph.* 3. 2. 19. *Ita ingenium meum eſt, Inimicos ſemper oſa ſum obtuerier. Gell.* l. 4. c. 8. *Hunc Fabricius non probabat, neque amico utebatur, oſuſque eum morum cauſâ fuit.* And ſo the compounds of it *peroſus & exoſus. Sueton. Tib.* c. 21. *Si non Populum Romanum peroſi ſunt. Curt.* l. 8 *Patriot mores exoſus es.* So *Ovid. Met* 8. l. *Longumque peroſus Exilium. Id. ib.* l. 1. *Illa velut crimen tædas exoſa jugales. Liv.* l. 8. *ab Vrbe. Plebs conſulum nomen, haut ſecus quàm regum, peroſa erat. Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 39. *Rhen.* p. 222.

Deſivi, and by *Syncope deſii* is ordinary: and in *Plaut.* as from *deſitus ſum*, is read *deſitum eſſ. Moſtell.* 4. 2. *Nunquam hic triduum unum deſitum eſſe & bibi. Gram. Gyphiſwald.* p. 53.

There are beſides theſe *Redundants* of other ſorts:

Firſt ſome have *two preterperfect* tenſes and both of the *active* form: as *conniveo connivi & connixi*; *parco peperci & parſi.*

Secondly, ſome *two Preterperfect* tenſes and both of

the *passive* form: as *niter nisus & nixus sum*; *fruor fructus & fruitus sum*, &c.

Thirdly, some are Redundant in their *supines* only: as *torqueo torsi tortum & torsum*; *indulgeo indulsi indultum & indulsum*.

Fourthly, Some are Redundant both in *Preterperfect* tense and *Supine*: as *sorbeo sorbui & sorpsi* (according to vulgar account) *sorbitum & sorptum*; *mulgeo mulsi & mulxi*, *mulsum & mulctum*, &c.

But as these are reckoned up all together in their orders by Mr. *Bird* in his Grounds of Grammar, p. 91, 92. so they have been severally touched in these Notes, in passing along, and may be found in their respective places, and so need not here again to be repeated.

And thus far of Verbs *Redundant*: Our next proceeding must be unto those that are *Variant*.

CHAP XIII.

Qu. **Which do you call Variant Verbs?**

An. *Variant Verbs* are those which in their declining do *vary* from the common form of declining.

Qu. **How many sorts of such verbs are considered here in the Grammar?**

An. In the Grammar here are considered two sorts of Variant Verbs, First some that are declined with an Irregular preterperfect tense formed from *themselves*. Secondly some that are declined with an irregular preterperfect tense borrowed from some *other Verb*.

Qu. **What verbs are declined with an irregular preterperfect formed from** themselves?

An. With an irregular preterperfect formed from *themselves* are declined some *Neuter-passives*.

Qu. **Which is the Rule for those Neuter-passives?**

An.

An. The Rule for those Neuter-passives is this:

De Neutro-passivorum præteritis.

Neutro-passivum sic præteritum tibi format,
Gaudeo gavisus sum; fido fisus & audeo
Ausus sum, fio factus, soleo solitus sum,
Mœreo sum mœstus; sed Phocæ nomen habetur.

Neutro-passivum sic præteritum.

Q. **What is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of the Rule is this: That some *Neuter-passives* are declined with a preterperfect tense of the *Passive* form; as *gaudeo gavisus sum; fido fisus sum; audeo ausus sum; soleo solitus sum.*

¶ *Neutro-passivum*] Verbs neuters though they neither be passives, because they end in *o* like Actives; nor be Actives, because they cannot take *r*, and become Passives, yet do many times partake with both the Active and the Passive, whence those distinctions of them into *Neuter-active*, and *Neuter-passive*, A *Neuter-active* is a verb, that is partly active, and partly neuter: *Active*, in that it hath an active signification and construction: *Neuter* in that it ends only in *o*, and cannot take *r*, and become a passive, as *ambio, conveno, facio, &c.* A *Neuter-passive* is a verb that is partly Neuter and partly Passive: *Neuter* in that it cannot take *r* and become a Passive; and *Passive* in that it either hath a passive signification and construction, as *vapulo, veneo, liceo, exulo*; or else a *Preterperfect tense of the Passive form* and termination, as *gaudeo gavisus, fido fisus, audeo ausus, soleo solitus*; or thirdly both, the passive signification and construction throughout the whole, and the passive form and termination in the preterperfect tense, as *fio factus sum.* And this accurateness of distinction I see observed by that rational and methodical Writer Mr. *Bird* School-master of *Gloceſter*; but by none else. *Scaliger* in his 5. l. *de cauſſ. Ling. Lat.* c. 100. gives us this account of these *minutiores antiquarum ſectiones*, as he calls those subdivisions of verbs made by the Ancients. *Inter Neutra* (ſaith he) *ſtatue*

ere Neutropaſſivum: ut exulo, vapulo: ac Neutra quidem, quoniam ex ſeſe Paſſivum non crearent: Paſſiva autem, quia ſignificatio recideret in eum de quo verbum dicebatur. Igitur ab accidente, hoc eſt a voce Neutra: a formâ, hoc eſt a ſignificatione Paſſiva dicta ſunt. But this deſcription is too narrow, reaching only unto the firſt branch of our diſtinction, ſo that *vapulo, veneo, &c.* ſhall only be *Neuter-paſſives*, but not *gaudeo, audeo*, and the reſt of that ſort; becauſe they do not ſignifie paſſively. *Sebaſtian Duisburgenſis* in his Notes on *Deſpauterius* defines a *Neuter-paſſive* thus: *Verbum neutro-paſſivum eſt, quod deſinens in o, facit præteritum ac ſi deſineret in or, ut ſoleo ſolitus ſum, &c.* And ſo the *Grammar of Gryphiſwald. Quædam verba dicuntur Neutro-paſſiva, quæ cum in o deſinant, præterita tamen more paſſivorum faciunt: ut audeo auſus ſum, &c.* But this deſcription alſo is too narrow, for it takes not in *exulo, vapulo, &c.* which have the paſſive ſignification, though they be not declined in any reſpect like paſſives; and therefore not only by *Scaliger*, and the Ancients before, but by our own *Grammar* alſo afterward, in the *Syntaxis*, where it treats of the conſtruction of paſſives, are called *Neuter-paſſives*; *vapulo, veneo, liceo, &c. Neutro-paſſiva paſſivam conſtructionem habent.* So the *Rule* there however here, by the examples our Authour ſeems to look upon thoſe only as *Neuter-paſſives* which have a preterperfect tenſe of the paſſive form and termination. To rectifie this miſtake Mr. *Hayne* in his Grammar reads this rule, not in the general, or indifinite way, as here, *Neutropaſſivum, &c.* but more particularly and reſtrainedly, *Neutro-paſſiva hæc ſic præteritum tibi formant, Gaudeo gaviſus ſum, &c.* Yet the meaning of *Duisburgenſis* and the *Gram. of Gryphiſw.* was not wholly to exclude thoſe of the firſt branch, *vapulo, veneo, &c.* for they bring them in under other terms of diſtinction, as unwilling to confound thoſe under one denomination, between which they ſaw there was a real diſtinction. The firſt calls them *Neutra-paſſiva. Ver-*

bum

bum neutrum-passivum (saith he) *quod in o desinens passivâ significat: ut sex hic posita, vapulo i. e. percutior, &c.* The second calls them *Neutralia passiva, quæ licet desinant in o, passive tamen significant*; And so doth *Vossius* too in the *Text* of his Grammar, though in his *Margine* he adds, *vel Neutro-passiva*, as intimating that they are called also *Neuter-passives*; yet adding that *Aliàs Neutro-passiva dicuntur, quia præteritum formant more passivorum, ut audeo ausus sum, &c.* Either term *Neutro-passiva* or *Neutra-passiva* will serve to take in all the members of our distinction, but neither of them do so distinctly note one member as to exclude the others, and become (as Mr. *Stockwood* in his Disputations qu. 29. p. 206. makes them) subdividing terms, as if those that are *Neutro-passiva* were not *Passiva-neutra*, *& vice versâ*. In this methinks there may be a reconciliation if *Neutro-passiva* be allowed to comprehend also all that are *Neutra-passiva*, or *Neutralia-passiva* as some speak, yet κατ' ἐξοχὴν to note those more especially, which form a passive preterperfect tense, as these in our Rule here do. Or again if *Neutra-passiva* be allowed to comprehend those also that are termed *Neutro-passiva*, yet more especially to note those, which have the signification, but not the formation of a passive. If any man think otherwise, I will not prescribe to his opinion or fancy. Only I seem not so well to relish that term *Neutralia-passiva*, because that to me seems to signifie Passives that are Neuters, or taken Neutrally, of which sort I know none distinct from Deponents signifying Neutrally, or Absolutely, as *orior* I rise, or *glorior* I boast, which if any man will call *Neutralia-passiva*, I shall not hinder him.

Gaudeo gavisus sum] From *gavisum* comes *gavisus*; and *gavisum* comes from *gavisi*, which formerly was in use; Hence *Cassius Hemina* in *Priscian.* l. 9. *Itaque admiratum esse gavisi.* So *Liv.* (there also) *Quoniam audici paucis, gavisi.* Though *gavisi* is now out of use.

Fido fisus] *Fisus* comes from *fisum*, and *fisum* from *fidi*,

fidi, once in uſe; whence *confidi* read in *Liv.* l. 4. *dec.* 5. *Agros confiderunt ſe a populationibus tueri poſſe.*

Et audeo auſus] *Auſus* is from *auſum* (as alſo *auſurus* in *Sall. Jug. Nihil illum auſurum palam.* And *Auſon. Turpe quid auſurus te ſine teſte time*) and that from *auſi* ſometimes uſed: (whence *Cato pro Luc. Anton.* in *Priſcian* l. 9. *Non auſi recuſare*) but now out of uſe.

Fio factus] This verb is properly a *Neuter paſſive*, as ending in *o* like an Active, and yet ſignifying like a Paſſive. But it is not properly placed in this Rule. For this Rule (at leaſt in my apprehenſion of it) intends only ſuch Verbs as form an irregular preterperfect tenſe from themſelves: but *fio* forms neither *factus*, as *Diomedes* l. 1. ſaith it doth, nor any other preterperf. from it ſelf, but wanting a preterperfect tenſe of its own, as *Voſſius* and *Farnaby* ſay, borrows one from another verb, and ſo belongs upon that account to the Rule following, *Quadam præteritum verba accipiunt aliunde.* The verb that it borrows its preterperfect from is *facior*, formerly uſed. Whence that of *Nigidius Figulus* cited by both *Voſſius* and *Saturnius*, *Id quod dicta hujuſmodi eſt*; ποιεῖται *facit*, ποιεῖται *facitur*, ποιεῖν *facere.* Thence not only thoſe compounds of this verb *afficior*, *perficior*, &c. Yet in uſe, but ſome others alſo grown out of uſe, as *parvifaciatur* written by *Titinnius in Quincto*, and *ſatisfacitur* by *Varro* in *Cynico*, as *Voſſius* from *Nonius*, and *Priſcian* ſhews. *Farnaby* p. 42. *Saturn.* l. 6. c. 5. *Voſſ. Analog.* l. 3. c. 38. *Daneſ.* l. 3. c. 15.

Soleo ſolitus ſum] *Solitus* is from *ſolitum*, and that from *ſolui*, which alſo anciently hath been in uſe, though now it be diſuſed. Thence *Sall.* l. 2. *Hiſtoriar.* cited by *Priſcian* l. 9. *Neque ſubſidiis uti ſoluerat compoſitis.* And *Cælius* l. 7. *Annal. in Nonius*, *Duos & ſeptuaginta victoris domum deportaviſſe faſces, qui ductoribus hoſtium ante ſoluerint ferri.* Of this verb *Saturnius* ſaith he reads no ſuch Participle as *ſoliturus*: and *Chariſius* ſaith it hath no future tenſe, becauſe one cannot be ſaid to have accuſtomed himſelf to that which but ſhall be.

Saturn.

Saturn. l. 6. c. 5. *Voſſ. Analog.* l. 3. c. 21.

Mœreo ſum mœſtus : ſed Phocæ nomen habetur] *Voſſius* in his Grammar declines *mœreo* with *mœſtus ſum*: and ſo *Duisburgenſius* on *Deſpauterius*, and *Farnaby* and *Burles*. Yet as *Farnaby* ſo *Voſſius* hath a marginal Note intimating as if *mœſtus* were no participle, but, as *Phocas* thought a noun; *Niſi mœſtus potius nomen eſt, ut videtur.* But what there he ſpeaks doubtingly of, in his *Analog.* l. 3. c. 24. he, and not *Saturnius* only, or *Rhenius*, doth confidently affirm. *At mœſtus nomen eſt; non participium, uti putârunt.* I ſee not why *mœreo* might anciently have formed *mœrui*, and thence *mœritum*, and by a Syncope *mœrtum*, and thence by a change of *r* into *s* (which is an ordinary change) *mœſtum* and ſo *mœſtus*. But on the other ſide I find degrees of compariſon *mœſtior* and *mœſtiſſimus* formed from this word, whereas none ſuch, that I meet with, are formed from the Participles of the reſt of theſe Neuter-paſſives; and that may be a preſumption, that it is no Participle like them, but a Noun; yet not infallible neither, becauſe I find no comparing of *feſſus*, or *laſſus*, which yet are ſuppoſed to be Nouns, and not Participles.

The *Grammar of Gryphiſwald*, together with theſe verbs, ranks and reckons up thoſe, which beſides their active preterperfect tenſe, have alſo a preterperfect tenſe of the paſſive form, as *prandeo prandi prauſus ſum; cœno cœnavi cœnatus ſum, &c.* And well they may, for ought I know be reckened here, upon the account of their Paſſive preterperfect tenſe, though upon the account of their Redundancie they be treated of in another Rule.

Q. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus: The declining of the words.

Gaudeo, gaudes, gauiſus ſum, gaudere, gauiſũ,
Fido, fidis, fiſus ſum, fidere, fiſum,
Audeo, audes, auſus ſum, audere, auſum,
Fio, fis, factus ſum, fieri, factũ,

Soleo,

Soleo, soles, solitus sum, solere, solitum,
Mœreo, mœres, mœstus sum, mœrere.

Thus far of Verbs declined with an *Irregular Preterperfect* tense formed from *themselves*.

CHAP. XIV.

Qu. Which is the Rule for those verbs that are declined with a preterperfect tense borrowed from another verb?

An. The Rule for those verbs that are declined with a preterperfect borrowed from some *other verb* is this:

De verbis præteritum mutuantibus.

Quædam præteritum verba.

Quædam præterperfectum verba accipiunt aliunde.

Qu. What is the meaning of this Rule?

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That some verbs which have no regular preterperfect tense of their own, are yet declined with the preterperfect tense of another verb, which so supplies the room of their preterperfect tense, as if it were their own.

Qu. How many sorts of verbs doth your Grammar here speak of, that do borrow a preterperfect from another verb?

An. There be three sorts of verbs here spoken of which borrow a preterperfect tense from another verb, The first is some *Inceptives* in *sco*: the second is some *particular* verbs in *o*; the third is some *particular* verbs in *or*.

Qu. What saith your Grammar touching Inceptives in sco?

An. Touching verbs Inceptives in *sco*, our Grammar saith this:

Inceptiva in sco.

Inceptivum in sco stans pro primario adoptat
Præteritum ejusdem verbi: vult ergo tepesco
A tepio tepui, ferveſco a ferveo fervi.

Qu.

Qu. **what is the meaning of this Rule?**

An. The meaning of this Rule is this: That verbs Inceptives in *sco* ſtanding for (that is, uſed or taken in the ſignification of) thoſe primative verbs, that they are derived from, are declined with the preterperfect tenſes of thoſe primative verbs, from which they are derived.

¶ *Inceptivum in ſco*] A verb *Inceptive* is properly ſuch a verb as betokens the beginning, or increaſe of any action, or paſſion, and may, ſaith *Rhenius*, be expounded by *incipio* or *fio*: as *labaſco*, i. e. *incipio labare*; *maturesco*, i. e. *fio maturus*. Not all *Inceptives* are declined with a borrowed preterperfect tenſe, but only thoſe that are formed from *verbs*: (for thoſe that are formed from *nouns* are declined with no preterperfect at all) and of thoſe that are formed from *verbs*, thoſe only are ſo declined, that are formed from verbs in *uſe*, having preterperfect tenſes, from which they are derived (an example of which putting we have in that of *Virgil*, *Incipiunt agitata tumeſcere* i. e. *tumere, vel tumeſieri*) for if the primitive have no preterperfect tenſe, or be out of uſe, then the inceptive is not declined with any preterperfect tenſe; one only that I know of, being excepted, namely *eviteſco*, which in *Suetonius* hath *evitui*, though no ſuch verb as *evitco* be read. *Voſſ. Etymolog.* p. 142. If any meet with any more, he may add them. It is very pertinent, that which *Saturnius* ſpeaking of theſe verbs ſaith, namely that, *Niſi vis inchoativa repugnet, ut præteritum habeant perfectum, authoritate tamen uſuque prævalente illud ipſum aut ex ſeſe habent, aut certe a ſuis primitivis (quanquam a nominibus deducta præterito perfecto carere exiſtimaverim) permutuantur, ut quod naturâ inchoatum eſt, id arte perficiatur, &c. Saturn. Merc. Maior.* l. c. c. 16.

Qu. **what other verbs doth your Grammar reckon up, which end in o, and borrow a preterperfect tenſe from ſome other verb?**

An.

An. The words in *o* which are declined with a borrowed preterperfect tense, are (with the preterperfect tenses which they borrow, and the verbs from which they borrow them) by our Grammar reckoned up thus:

A video cerno vult vidi.

A video cerno vult vidi; a concutio vult Preteritum quatio concussi; a percutioque Percussi ferio: a mingo vult mejo minxi: A sedeo sido vult sedi, a suffero tollo Sustuli; & a suo sum fui; a tulo rite fero tuli: A sto stilo steti tantum pro stare: furoque Insanivi a verbo ejusdem significati.

Q. **What is the meaning of this branch of the Rule?**

An. The meaning of this branch of the Rule is this: That *cerno* [to see] borrows *vidi* from *video*; *quatio* borrows *concussi* from *concutio*; *ferio* borrows *percussi* from *percutio*; *meio* borrows *minxi* from *mingo*; *sido* borrows *sedi* from *sedeo*; *tollo* borrows *sustuli* from *suffero*; *sum* borrows *fui* from *fuo*; *fero* borrows *tuli* from *tulo*; *stilo* [in the sense of *standing* only] borrows *steti* from *sto*; and *furo* borrows *insanivi* from *insanio*.

¶ *A video cerno*] Of this see before in *No sit vi.*

Quatio concussi] *Quassi*, if read, is rare: therefore *concussi* which is ordinary, is ordinarily declined with this verb, as the preterperfect tense of it. But see before in *Tio tti.*

Percussi ferio] *Ferio*, as *Vossius* from *Charisius* notes, anciently had *ferii* for its preterperfect tense, which now is grown out of use. And though *Servius* on *Virg. Æn.* 7. refuse not *feriturum*, nor *Petrarcha feritum*, saying in 8. *Africæ, Pax populis ducibusque placet fœdusque feritum*, yet they are not to be followed therein.

Mejo minxi] *Diomedes* allows of *meii* of *mingo*, whence this is said to borrow a preterperfect tense, *Vossius* wonders how it came to be so, as it is now in use, being

ing an obsolete verb. *Phocas*, *Diomedes*, and *Priscian* have it. And upon the account of their *Authority* doubtless it was anew taken up *Voss. de Etym* p. 155. *Alvar.* p. 248.

Sido vult sedi] That *sido* borrows *sedi* from *sedeo*, that *Seneca de Benef.* l. 2. c. 8. shews: *Cum subsedit cupiditas, &c.* Yet *Columella.* l. 12. c. 24. hath the proper preterperfect of this verb: *Patiemur picem considere, & cum considerit, aquam eliquabimus. Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 26. *Danes. Schol.* l. 2. c. 15.

A suffero tollo \ *sustuli*] *Tollo*, or *tulo*, as they did anciently express it, of old had *tetuli*: instead of which the compound *sustuli* is now in use: but that is not from *suffero*, as here is said, but from *sustollo*: for *suffero* it self borrows its preterperfect tense from *sustollo*. Now that is read in *Plaut. Mil. Glor.* 2 3. *Credo hercle has sustulat ædes totas, atque hinc in crucem. Catull. Carm. de Nupt. Pel. & Thet. Candiaque interti sustollant vela rudentes. Cæl. Aurelian.* l. 1. *Erit igitur sustollendus ægrotans subjectione manuum ex utrâque alarum parte.* So from *atollo* or *attulo* is *attuli*; from *absollo* or *abstulo* is *abstuli*; from *contollo contuli*; and from *protollo protuli*, though those preterperfect tenses be not now declined ordinarily with those verbs, but rather with the compounds of *fero*, *affero*, *confero*, *profero*. *Voss. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 37.

Et a fuo fum fui] *Fuo* is read in *Plaut. Bacch.* 1. 2. *Ne phœnix facilis tuis fuam. Id. Capt.* 2. 3. 71. *Caveto mihi ivatus suas. Id. Perf.* 1. 1. 52. *Cave suas mihi in custione. Virg. Æn.* 10. *Tros Tyriusve fuat, nullo discrimine agetur. Plaut. Capt.* 2. 2. 10. *Si fuat. occasio*: and in many places more. *Par. Lex. Plaut. Saturni.* p. 280.

A tulo rite fero tuli] For *tuli* they anciently said *tetuli*. Hence *Plaut. Amph.* 2. 2. *Osculum tetuli tibi. Id. Rud.* 4. 1. *Volupe est hodie me his mulierculis tetulisse auxilium. Ter. And.* 4. 6. *Si id scissem, nunquam hus tetulissem pedem. Plaut. Menæch.* 2. 3. *Huc*

is

in bant urbem pedem nisi hodie nunquam intro tetulit. Now that reduplication is grown out of use in this word.

A sto sisto steti tantum pro stare] That is, *sisto* the neuter [to *stand*] hath *steti*, whereas *sisto* the active [to *make to stand*] hath *stiti*. Of which see before in *To sisti.*

Furoque insanivi a verbo ejusdem significati] That is *furo* borrows *insanivi* from *insanio.* In *Sedulius* l. 1. *operis paschatis*, as *Vossius* saith, there is read *furui. Nec minus & Darii furuerunt jussa tyranni.* But in any Classick Authour, you will neither meet with preterperfect nor Supine of this verb. Yea *furo* it self, saith *Vossius*, is insolent. Yet it was used by *Varro*, as *Priscian* saith, who bids it be declined, *furis, furit. In Arat.* l. 11. there is read, *Cui pelagus telluſque furunt.* *Voss. de Anal.* l. 3. c. 30.

Hither may be referred *gigno*, which borrows its preterperfect *genui*, from the old verb *geno.* Of which see above, *Gigno, pono, cano*, So *nexo, nexas*, hath *nexui* from *necto*, or *nexo*; *Lavo, lavas*, hath *lavi*, from *lavo, lavis, &c.* Of which before.

Qu. What particular verbs in or doth your Grammar here reckon up, which borrow their preterperfect from other verbs?

An. The particular verbs in *or*, which borrow a preterperfect from other verbs are by our Authour reckoned up thus.

Sic poscunt vescor.

Sic poscunt vescor, medeor, liquor, reminiscor
Præteritum a pascor, medicor, liquefio, recordor.

Qu. What is the meaning of this part of the Rule?

An. The meaning of this part of the Rule is this: That *vescor* in the declining of it, borrows from *pascor* its preterperfect *pastus* to be declined withal, so *medeor* borrows *medicatus* from *medicor*; *liquor* borrows *liquefactus* from *liquefio*; and *reminiscor* borrows *recordatus* from *recordor.*

¶ *Sic poſcunt*] It is not to be thought, that theſe preterperfect tenſes, *paſtus*, *medicatus*, *liquefactus*, *recordatus* are the preterperfect tenſes of thoſe verbs which borrow them from their own verbs: for the borrowers of them have no preterperfect tenſes of their own: but this is all, that for the ſupply of their defect of preterperfect tenſes, it is grown an uſe to name the preterperfect tenſes of the other verbs of like ſenſe with them in the room of theirs. And ſo *Phocas*, *Ad ſupplementum declinationis defectivis accommodantur*. And the ſame may be ſaid of the reſt before. See *Voſſ. de Analog.* l. 3. c. 28.

Qu. **How are the words of this Rule declined?**

An. The words of this Rule are declined thus: The declining of the words.

Tepeſco, tepeſcis, tepui, tepeſcere,
Tepeo, tepes, tepui, tepere
Ferveſco, ferveſcis, fervi, ferveſcere,
Ferveo, ferves, fervi, fervere,
Video, vides, vidi videre, viſum,
Cerno, cernis, vidi, cernere, viſum,
Quatio, quatis, concuſſi [quaſſi] quatere, concuſſum [quaſſum]
Percutio, percutis, percuſſi, percutere, percuſſum,
Ferio, feris, percuſſi, ferire, percuſſum,
[Mingo, mingis, minxi, mingere, mictum,]
Meio, meis, minxi, meiere, mictum,
Sedeo, ſedes, ſedi, ſedere, ſeſſum,
Sido, ſidis, ſedi, ſidere, ſeſſum,
Suffero, ſuffers, ſuſtuli, ſufferre, ſublatum,
Tollo, tollis, ſuſtuli, ſufferre, ſublatum,
[Fuo, Fuis, fui, fuere, futum,]
Sum, es, fui, eſſe,
[Tulo, tulis, tuli, [tetuli] tulere, latum,]
Fero, fers, tuli, ferre, latum,
Sto, ſtas, ſteti, ſtare, ſtatum,
Sisto, ſiſtis, ſteti, ſiſtere, ſtatum,
Inſanio, inſanis, inſanivi, inſanire, inſanitum,
[Furo] furis, inſanivi, furere, inſanitum,
Paſcor, paſceris, paſtus ſum, paſci, paſtus,